



BV825

v.3466



THE

Eucharist,

ITS

HISTORY, DOCTRINE, AND PRACTICE,

WITH

MEDITATIONS AND PRAYERS SUITABLE

TO THAT

Holy Sacrament.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M.A.,

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON:

W. J. CLEAVER, 46, PICCADILLY.

MDCCCLI.

973

RICHARDS, 100 ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

P R E F A C E.

No clergyman can have any great degree of ministerial intercourse with his parishioners, without perceiving to what an endless extent objections, excuses, and erroneous opinions of every shade and character prevail, on the subject of the Holy Communion.

As far as my own humble experience has been concerned, not only among the absolutely poor, but the middle and higher classes of society, the fear and distrust—sometimes the ignorance—which is displayed on this most important subject, has been truly surprising; and it needs but very little observation on the part of any man, to perceive the extraordinary disproportion between the *congregations* of our church, and the number of her regular *communicants*.

In the course of my ministerial duties, I endeavoured, in the year 1835, to explain from the

pulpit, in a series of sermons during Lent, the nature and objects of this Holy Sacrament: and I repeated the same to a different congregation in the year 1837. Since that time I have been urged to advance still further, and to commit the substance of my observations to the press. Many alterations, and much matter, as the reader will observe, not suitable to the pulpit, has now been added, and the whole is put together, as a sort of manual of information on the subject of THE EUCHARIST.

If Christians desire to “walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless,” they will at least allow this Sacrament to be worthy of consideration. They will at least allow that it is a subject on which they may safely entertain a *question*.

Is the Eucharist an ordinance of the Lord? Is it necessary for Christian men to *walk in it*? And once having allowed it to be entertained as a *question*, it surely becomes their duty, according to their several abilities, to answer that question by an impartial inquiry into its nature and obligation, so that there may be peace between themselves and God.

This is a postulate which no rational man can refuse. It is the foundation upon which I would beseech him to read the following pages.

I do not presume to imagine that this book will have any material circulation beyond the congregations with whom, under the grace of God, I am personally connected. For them it is drawn up, and to their service it is dedicated. But if it should, by the blessing of the Lord, have any further extension; if it should be the means, in any one person, of inducing a further and more serious consideration of his sacramental obligations; if it should draw the steps *but of one*, to the altar of Jesus Christ;—my “labour will not be in vain in the Lord.”

My object has been, in the First Part, to put together such a collection of matter as may attract the attention of the well-educated, without affecting the dryness or the depth of theological learning; and I have added, as a Second Part, some meditations and prayers, as a weekly preparation.

May the husbandman who sows the seed, in his own good time bring forth the fruit, some thirty, some sixty, some an hundred fold.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

IT is now nine years since the First Edition of this work was published—but they are nine years full of momentous things to our dear Church—the Church of England. I now feel, deeply feel, how little I knew, and, therefore, how presumptuous I must have been, then but young in the Lord's Vineyard, thus to write—and so perhaps what little has been added to the stock may appear still less in nine years hence again. And so advancing—we shall not rest—gaining in reality but little, until the glass through which we now see darkly shall expand into the bright and perfect vision of the living God, and we shall know as we are known.

But things are better. I have been enabled to say much more in this edition than in the first—for we are all better enabled to receive it—we think better than we did nine years ago—we *act* better—our Holy Eucharist is higher thought of—more frequently administered, more godly and reverently performed, and its doctrines and bless-

ings deeper and steadier in the hearts of our people: Praise be to God.

The mention of the real presence is not now necessarily confounded with transubstantiation—nor the notion of a sacrifice, with the sacrifice of the Mass. We can receive the Body and Blood of our Blessed Lord, without of necessity being forced to think that we receive the *carnal* or *corporeal* Body. We can kneel down before the Altar and do acts of reverence, and place lights thereon according to the commands of the Church, without minding any Puritanic cry raised by the evil and the ignorant: Praise be to God.

Holy Festivals of our Church are now observed, and the Altar is decked, and made ready for the banquet, and the many guests approach; the commemoration of saints is gladly received, and their communion with joy sought for; and the Holy Eucharist binds us with them, and with God; and we shrink not from believing and teaching it: and yet it is not thought, that thereby we worship saints, or pray for their intercession: Praise be to God.

But all this we did not think nine years ago—and if we thought it, we dared not say it.

So let us argue from the past to the future—and thus we may argue.

Nine years more of steady perseverance will see these things prevail more strongly and more earnestly, and in greater numbers—and as men awake from their sleep, or are dislodged from their prejudices—they will forsake dissent, hate schism, see no necessity to fly to Rome in order to be devout; but being of the Church of England, will know that they are Catholics, and can serve God in her with reverence and godly fear.

May God of His infinite mercy bring us to this issue—and if these few words now written, in His Church ever loved, and faithfully obeyed, shall prevail with any—to God be the praise. Let the priest's voice now, as David's was of old, be lifted up in all sincerity: "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem. They shall prosper that love Thee. Peace be within thy walls, and plenty within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sake, I will now say—Peace be within thee,—Because of the House of the Lord our God, I will seek to do thee good."

S. PAUL'S,

Feast of S. James the Apostle,

1846.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

NATURE AND DESIGN.

	PAGE
Preliminary Remarks - - - - -	1
Romish and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacraments, how opposed - - - - -	2
The Scripture Account - - - - -	10
Reason of S. John's silence - - - - -	12
Definition of the Eucharist - - - - -	20
Comparison with the Passover - - - - -	24
Harmony - - - - -	30

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY : FROM ITS FIRST APPOINTMENT TO THE CLOSE OF THE SIXTH CENTURY.

The First Century. The Scriptures - - - - -	37
Second Century. Ignatius, Pliny, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria - - - - -	42
Third Century. Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian - - - - -	48
Fourth Century. Christianity the Religion of the State.—The ancient Liturgies.—Basil, Chry- sostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Eusebius, Athana- sius, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Augustine - - - - -	56

Fifth Century. Image Worship, Vices of the Clergy, Theodoret, Gelasius, Liturgy of S. Cyril of Alexandria - - - - -	70
Sixth Century. Temporal power of the Pope, Canon of the Mass, Fulgentius, Facundus, Ephrem, Dionysius, Hesychius, Procopius -	78

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY : FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE SEVENTH, TO
THE CONCLUSION OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

The Seventh Century. Gregory the Great, Moham- med, Relics, First glance of Transubstantia- tion, Isidore, Eligius - - - - -	89
Eighth Century. Solitary Masses, Bede, John Damascenus, Alcuinus - - - - -	97
Ninth and Tenth Centuries. Purgatory, Masses for the Dead, Bertram, Johannes Scotus, Amalarius, Rabanus Maurus - - - - -	104
Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. Berenger, The real presence, Communion in both kinds, Lanfranc, Rupert, Anselm, Theophylact, Alger	110
Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. Council of Lateran, Transubstantiation, the Host, Wick- liffe - - - - -	118

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY : FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FIFTEENTH
CENTURY TO THE PRESENT TIME.

The Fifteenth Century. Wickliffites, Council of Con- stance, Huss, Jerome of Prague - - - - -	126
--	-----

Sixteenth Century. Luther, Melancthon, Carlos-	
tadt, Zuingli, Calvin, Consubstantiation	- 129
Henry VIII. Reformation in England	- - 140
Cranmer, Advance of Religious Opinion	- 149
Edward VI.	- - - - - 153
Disputations held at the Universities	- - 158
Articles of 1552	- - - - - 163
Mary	- - - - - 168
Elizabeth, Alteration of Articles	- - - 169
Council of Trent	- . - - - 173

CHAPTER V.

PRESENT FORM OF OBSERVANCE.

<i>Place of Administration.</i>	Altar, Cloths, Chalice,	
Patens, &c.	- - - - -	182
<i>Pre-communion.</i>	Who present, Lord's Prayer, Col-	
	lect, Commandments, &c.	- - 190
	Offertory	- - - - - 202
	Prayer for the Church Militant	- 210
<i>Communion.</i>	Its three-fold division	- - - 211
	The Preparation	- - - - - 213
	The Invitation and Confession	- - 215
	The Absolution	- - - - - 216
	The Comfortable Words	- - - 220
	The Trisagium	- - - - - 221
	Prayer of Access	- - - - - 223
	The Consecration and its divisions	- 224
	The Distribution	- - - - - 229
<i>Post-communion.</i>	Lord's Prayer, &c.	- - - 233
	Gloria in Excelsis	- - - - - 235

CHAPTER VI.

ERRORS AND OBJECTIONS.

	PAGE
I. Perfection necessary - - - - -	243
II. Mistaken passages in Scripture - - - - -	248
III. Not universally necessary - - - - -	257
IV. Sin afterwards unpardoned - - - - -	262
V. Deferring to Sickness - - - - -	268
VI. Want of time for preparation - - - - -	274
VII. Frequency - - - - -	279
VIII. Continuance in sin - - - - -	285

CHAPTER VII.

MOTIVES.

I. The command of Christ - - - - -	293
II. Gratitude - - - - -	299
III. Extension of Christ's kingdom upon earth - - - - -	307
IV. Our own spiritual welfare - - - - -	321

CHAPTER VIII.

REQUISITES.

Of the Church	I. Baptism - - - - -	333
	II. Confirmation - - - - -	340
Personal	III. Repentance - - - - -	346
	IV. Charity - - - - -	351
	V. Thankful remembrance of Christ's death - - - - -	357
	VI. Intention of amendment - - - - -	363
	VII. Faith - - - - -	368

PART II.

THE DIARY.

I. THE LORD'S DAY.

	PAGE
Meditation upon hearing the notice of the holy Eucharist	
read by the minister - - - - - -	37
The Examination - - - - - - -	382
A Penitential Exercise - - - - - -	402

II. MONDAY.

STATE OF MAN BY NATURE.

The Meditation—Inability of Man - - -	416
The Remedy - - - - - - -	421
The Prayer - - - - - - -	424

III. TUESDAY.

STATE OF MAN BY THE LAW.

The Meditation—Condemnation of Man - -	427
The Remedy - - - - - - -	433
The Prayer - - - - - - -	436

IV. WEDNESDAY.

SINS OF HABIT.

	PAGE
The Meditation—Difficulty of Change - - -	439
The Remedy - - - - -	444
The Prayer - - - - -	448

V. THURSDAY.

SINS OF TEMPTATION.

The Meditation—Continual Danger - - -	452
The Remedy - - - - -	458
The Prayer - - - - -	464

VI. FRIDAY.

THE GRACES OF THE GOSPEL.

The Meditation—Difficulty of Attainment - -	467
The Means - - - - -	474
The Prayer - - - - -	478

VII. SATURDAY.

HEAVENLY MINDEDNESS.

The Meditation—Difficulty of Attainment - -	481
The Means - - - - -	489
The Prayer - - - - -	493

VIII.

THE MORNING OF THE EUCHARIST.

A Prayer - - - - -	497
--------------------	-----

IX.

AFTER THE RECEPTION OF THE EUCHARIST.

A Prayer - - - - -	500
--------------------	-----

THE EUCHARIST.

PART I.

HISTORY, DOCTRINE, AND PRACTICE.

Before all things, this we must be sure of especially, that this Supper be in such wise done and administered, as our Lord and Saviour did, and commanded to be done; as His holy apostles used it, and the good fathers in the primitive Church frequented it.—CHURCH OF ENGLAND HOMILY.

“*If ye love me, KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS.*”—John xiv. 15.



THE EUCHARIST.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

NATURE AND DESIGN.

LUKE XXII, 15.

And he said unto them, with desire I have desired to eat *this passover* with you before I suffer.

EVERY religion has certain forms and ceremonies by which its professors are distinguished—certain badges or tokens by which mankind publicly proclaim their assent and concurrence in the faith which that religion upholds.

In human institutions, and societies which are established for the mutual protection, or mutual pleasure, of the community, a man cannot be called a member, cannot be allowed to share the benefits which they propose, or enjoy the privileges which they confer, unless he professedly conforms to their usages, and obeys their rules. How, therefore, in a church, or religious society, can a man be called a *member*, or hope to share the benefits which are

held forth, or enjoy the privileges which are conferred—unless, in the same manner, he openly coincides with the public usages, and obeys the common laws which such an institution considers to be necessary? Now, in the Christian religion, in what do we find these *ordinances*, or *public usages*, or *common laws*, to consist? for whatever they may be, they only can be said to be members of that religion, who have conformed, or intend to conform, to them.

First then we find the Christian religion in this country to consist of two principal divisions, both calling themselves Catholic, but distinguished, the one by the name of the *Roman*, the other by the name of the *Anglican* or English Church; and if we enter into the causes of this division, we shall find that they consist very mainly in the different opinions which are held respecting those very ordinances. But let us observe, although the two churches differ, although they separate from one another in consequence of that difference, and set up rules of faith in direct opposition one to another, on many material points; still they both agree in the great and fundamental principle with which we are at present dealing:—namely, that *there are some ordinances in the Christian religion which are necessary to be observed*; they both say that no man can be a member of the church of Christ, unless

he perform those ordinances which the church of Christ has commanded ; and it does not therefore interfere with the point at issue, that there should be any difference of opinion as to *what* those ordinances should be,—if anything, it increases the principle and strength of the conclusion,—namely, that in every church there is a necessity of conforming to such public ordinances, usages, and ceremonies, as that church, or religious society maintains. And let us observe—a matter of *necessity*, not a matter of choice.

Whether, therefore, the Christian be a Romanist, or Catholic of the Church in England, there can be no pretext or evasion by which he may escape the duty of performing those outward rites which his church has ordained. If he refuse to perform them, he cannot be a member of that church, for he virtually withdraws himself from her. He virtually gives up the benefits which are held out. He virtually says to this effect:—I differ from you on the obligation of this or that law, which you, as a body, have commanded ; *I* do not deem necessary that which you *do* deem necessary ; I will not observe those forms which you assert to be necessary for the right constitution of a member of your society ; I therefore am no longer a member of you ; I withdraw from your institution.

The obligation then of performing those ordi-

nances which the church appoints, being once established; let us go on to see what those ordinances are:—In the Roman-Catholic division, we shall find that they consist of *seven* distinct ceremonies; in the Anglo-Catholic, we shall find that they consist of *six* distinct ceremonies. The seven of the Roman-Catholic church, are Confirmation, Marriage, Holy Orders, Penance, Extreme Unction, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. Of these, the Church of England considers four as holy ceremonies, or sacramental rites, having services in her Prayer-Book for each: namely Confirmation, Marriage, Ordination, and the Communion, or denouncing God's anger and judgment against sinners—used on the first day of Lent. Marriage she allows in the Book of Homilies to be a sacrament *in an inferior sense*. Extreme Unction she entirely rejects. The remaining two only, she agrees with the Roman Church, in pronouncing “*sacraments necessary to salvation.*”*

* The doctrine of the two Churches, as to the sacraments, is thus set forth :

“Those five, commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have grown, partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained by God.”—*Articles of the Church of England.* Art. xxv.

“If any man shall say, that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, or that they are more

Now, in contemplating this most important subject, there are three points upon which our conviction must be ascertained, before we shall be able fully to appreciate the nature and value of a sacrament necessary to salvation. First, it seems to be required, that any sacred rite or ceremony which is necessary for the constitution of a member of the church, should have for its authority, no other than the divine founder of that church.* Secondly—it must be allowed, that that which is appointed as a universal law, should be universally applicable. Thirdly—it must be allowed, that there should be a specific object in the appointment. Now, trying the seven sacraments of the Roman church by these tests, five of them will immediately fall to the ground; marriage and ordination, by the second rule, because they are not universally applicable, there being no command in the word of God that all should enter the state of marriage, and it being impossible that all should enter the

or fewer in number than seven: namely, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or, that any of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be accursed.”—*Council of Trent,—of the Sacraments. Canon i.*

* “The only author of a sacrament is God; first, because He is the only author of the promise and covenant of grace, and whosoever part it is to promise and give the grace, His part it is to seal it. Secondly, God is the only author of the word, therefore of the sacraments, which are the visible word. Thirdly, the sacraments are a part of divine worship, and divine worship can only be instituted by God.”—*Turretin,—Instit. Theol. Elenct. Locus decimus nonus.*

state of holy orders: penance is set aside, either by the first rule, or by the third—taking it as an outward mortification of the body, it is nowhere commanded as a sacrament; taking it as a general mortification of the soul, there is no specific object; repentance being a general emotion of the mind, and no more a sacrament than hope, faith, humility, or any other Christian duty arising from spiritual emotions: confirmation and extreme unction are set aside by the first rule, because never appointed by the divine Author of our religion,—confirmation being an apostolical ordinance appointed after the death of Christ, and extreme unction being only a partial and temporary institution mentioned in an accidental manner by one of the apostles.* These

* To shew the ground upon which extreme unction is accounted a sacrament in the Roman Church, while it is disregarded even as a religious ceremony by the Anglican Church, we cannot do better than refer to the Council of Trent, which speaks as follows;

“OF THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

“This Holy Unction of the sick, was instituted by our Lord Christ, truly and properly a sacrament of the New Testament, as is implied indeed by S. Mark, but commanded and promulgated to the faithful by James the Apostle, and brother of our Lord,” &c.

And the first canon upon this point stands as follows: “If any man shall say that extreme unction is not truly or properly a sacrament instituted by our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James, but only a rite received from the fathers, let him be accursed.”—And the passage in S. Mark, above referred to, is found in chap. vi, ver. 13, where there is not the slightest hint of any institution of a general sacrament, but only an account of the bodily healing, miraculously effected by the twelve apostles, in which they had used the common Jewish ceremony of anointing. The passage in S. James, is in chap. v, ver. 14, where again the allusion is made to the healing of the body, not the

five being put aside, we are brought to the remaining two ; and these we are prepared to shew to be perfect in the three points or rules above laid down:—First, appointed by Jesus Christ, the divine Founder of the church ; Secondly, universally applicable ; and Thirdly, having a specific object :—and therefore, while we reject the others, we agree with the church of Rome in considering them necessary to salvation : These we consider as the commandments of our Lord, and therefore, the only and the necessary method by which a man is constituted and continued a member of the church of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.

The two great sacraments then of the church of England, are Baptism and the Supper of the Lord ; Baptism, the initiatory rite by which a man is first admitted into Christ's church, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; and the Lord's Supper, by which a man having been previously admitted, *continues* himself a member of the church, by representing from time to

soul, and no notion can be traced of any inward and spiritual grace. To these passages they may add 1 John, chap. v, ver. 16, but in all, the very texts brought forward are the best refutation of the whole doctrine. In all the instances of anointing the sick, the miraculous cure was *effected*, and the sick arose in recovered bodily health ; whereas, the Romanists never administer their so-called sacrament of extreme unction to any but those at the point of death, and who they think, at the time of administering, *will not recover*.—See, upon this subject, *Macknight on 1 John, chap. v. ver. 16.*

time, upon certain conditions, and in a certain specified manner, his adherence to that faith which he commenced at his Baptism. They are called *sacraments*,* from the resemblance which they bear to the oath of the Roman soldier, by which oath, fidelity was promised on the part of the soldier to his general. In the like manner, in *Baptism*, fidelity to God is promised on the part of the person baptized, and in the *Lord's Supper*, on the part of the communicant.

The latter of these two sacraments is the one to which our attention is at present more particularly called, because, Baptism being the way of admittance into the church, and being in general received in infancy, there seldom arises any question upon the necessity of its observance: but in the case of the Lord's Supper, too many think themselves at liberty to reject or observe it according to their own pleasure. They have already become members of the church by Baptism; but the question is,

* Augustin says, that they are called sacraments, "because they are signs pertaining to sacred things." The schoolmen say, that a sacrament is "the visible form of an invisible grace." The Council of Trent says, "a sacrament is a thing subject to the senses, which has the force, not only of signifying a grace, but also of producing it." S. Paul's definition is, "the sign and seal of the righteousness of faith" (Rom. iv, 2). Therefore, upon the whole, we may say that sacraments are signs and seals, sacred, visible, and divinely instituted, for the sake of signifying, and sealing to our consciences, the promises of saving grace in Christ, and in turn, for the sake of testifying our faith, and affection, and obedience towards God.—*Turretin*.

whether they will *continue* members of the church? and though, unfortunately, many thousands of persons never consider any other sacrament, than that of Baptism, at all necessary to their being Christians; yet, that individual opinion proves nothing, when set against the authority of the church; and the church, positively and without hesitation, affirms, upon the command of Christ, that the observance of one sacrament is as necessary to salvation as the other. Our *Baptismal* covenant is to be renewed, from time to time, in the further covenant of the *Lord's Supper*. We must *re-register* our names in the book of Life. Both sacraments are necessary to salvation, not one without the other, but both. A man would be surprised to have the title of Christian denied him, because, having arrived at mature age, he has never partaken of the Lord's Supper; but surely (I put it strongly, but I think, truly) that man who deliberately says, "I will never participate in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper," does, in fact, withdraw himself from the church of Christ,—does, in fact, rescind the covenant made at his Baptism, and can with no better reason call himself a member of the church of Christ, than he who has never been baptized.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is generally denominated by Christians "*the Sacrament*". Emphatically so, as being the only one that requires

repetition, and the only one upon which any discussion, as just now explained, can arise. “It is called “*the Lord’s Supper*”, or “*Eucharist*.” Eucharist, from a Greek word, signifying “giving thanks”, which word is found in all the accounts of the institution contained in the Scriptures; and “Lord’s Supper”, obviously from its being instituted at the last supper of which our blessed Lord partook with His disciples.* Three of the evangelists, together with the apostle S. Paul, have given a direct account of this sacred ordinance. In that which stands as the first gospel in our bible, S. Matthew, the words are these: “Now when even was come, He sat down with the twelve. . . . And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to His disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the

* The names of this holy sacrament, annexed according to date, are thus given by Waterland :

A.D.

- 33. *Breaking of Bread*,—Acts ii. 42, 46, Acts xx. 7.
- 57. *Communion*,—1 Cor. x. 16.
- 57. *Lord’s Supper*,—1 Cor. xi. 20.
- 96. *Oblation*,—Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, Irenæus.
- 104. *Sacrament*,—Tertullian, Cyprian.
- 107. *Eucharist*,—Ignatius, Justin Martyr.
- 150. *Sacrifice*,—Justin Martyr, Cyprian.
- 150. *Commemoration*,—Justin Martyr, Origen, Eusebius.
- 249. *Passover*,—Origen, Hilary, Jerome.
- 385. *Mass*,—Ambrose, &c.—*Waterland’s Review*, c. i.

remission of sins.”* The next account is in S. Mark, as follows: “And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave it to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them; and they all drank of it: and He said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.”† The account of S. Luke, which is next in order, runs thus: “And He took bread, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you: *This do in remembrance of me.* Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you;”‡ where it is to be observed that he makes this remarkable addition to the accounts of S. Matthew and S. Mark: “*This do in remembrance of me.*” Next, the apostle S. Paul gives nearly the same account as S. Luke: “The Lord Jesus the same night in which He was betrayed took bread: and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this

* Matt. xxvi. 20, 26-28. † Mark xiv. 22. ‡ Luke xxii. 19.

bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." * Where, in addition to what had before been said by S. Luke, the apostle adds the remarkable intimation, that the institution of the Eucharist was to be the means of keeping up the remembrance of Jesus Christ, "*until He come,*" that is, until the end of the world; and that therefore it was a perpetual and never-ceasing symbol, to be borne by the faithful; one by which they might display their faith, one by which the merits of Christ's death might be from time to time vividly set forth, and represented to the world.

Our attention has no doubt been directed to one particular circumstance in this collation of the accounts—the silence of the evangelist S. John. This evangelist nowhere formally records the institution: the beloved apostle, who was with his master continually, as His most chosen friend and beloved companion, fails to give any detailed account of this dying command of his Lord. This omission may seem remarkable; but upon a little examination, the difficulty is soon cleared up. In order to do this, let us first take S. Matthew's account of those circumstances which were *previous*, and those which were *subsequent*, to the institution of the Eucharist, and then compare them with the same circumstances as related by S. John. We

* 1 Cor. xi. 23, and following verses.

shall thus perceive more closely what S. John omits, and where he coincides with the relation of his brother evangelists.*

In the twenty-first chapter of S. Matthew, we find our Saviour entering into Jerusalem in procession, and casting out the buyers and sellers from the temple. The intervening chapters between the twenty-first and twenty-sixth are occupied by various parables and prophecies. In the twenty-sixth chapter, two days before the Passover, we find Jesus in conversation with His disciples, and the woman pouring the alabaster box of ointment upon His head. Then in the seventeenth verse, on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, we find the disciples asking our Lord where they should prepare the feast of the passover. In the twentieth verse we find Him sitting down to meat with the twelve, proclaiming to Judas His knowledge of the treachery meditated against Him, and then immediately after, instituting the Eucharist. The accounts given by S. Mark and S. Luke of the same period of time, namely, between the entry of Christ into Jerusalem, and the institution of the Eucharist, differ but little; S. Luke only mentioning, in addition, the contention of the disciples as to which should be the greatest.† Now, therefore, turning to S. John, let us look for *his* account of

* See the Harmony at the end of this chapter. † Luke xxii, 24.

the same period of time. In the twelfth chapter we shall find the public entry into Jerusalem, and in the thirteenth chapter we shall find the following description: "Now, before the feast of the Passover, when Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end. And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray Him." Now, this expression, "*supper being ended*", cannot mean the *whole* of the pascal supper, because we find our Saviour, in a few verses subsequent, adverting to the sop by which the betrayer was distinguished, and this sop must have been given during the supper. The *whole* of the supper then was not ended. The truth is, that the pascal supper was observed in two parts, first the eating of unleavened bread and bitter herbs, which was called the antepast or preparation, and then the actual eating of the pascal lamb. Therefore the expression of S. John, "*supper being ended*", must mean the antepast, or first part of the pascal supper. After which, as the evangelist continues at the fourth verse, "He riseth from supper, and laid aside His garments; and took a towel and girded Himself. After that He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them

with the towel wherewith he was girded." Now here again, this circumstance of washing the disciples' feet is not related at all by the other evangelists, and if we compare it with S. Luke, it may seem to agree with another circumstance which he (S. Luke) stands alone in recording, namely, the contention of the disciples as to one being greater than another. Only supposing that S. Luke placed the circumstance of the contention after the *antepast* instead of the *whole supper*, and we shall then have a very consistent arrangement. And we may do so with great propriety, because we should hardly conceive it possible that the disciples would have this contention after so solemn an institution as the Eucharist,—an institution of peace, equality, and humility,—and, even setting that aside, that they should even do so, after the manifest rebuke conveyed by the washing of their feet, by their own Master and Lord. Keeping, however, S. John in view—after the washing of the feet, and the conversation which arose in consequence of it, between our Saviour and S. Peter, which is contained between the fourth and seventeenth verses, the pascal lamb (the remaining part of the supper, which was yet unfinished) was then brought in. Then arises the conversation between Peter, John, and Jesus,* by which Judas is marked

* Verse 23.

out as the betrayer of his Lord; and after this we find no further notice taken of the pascal supper. From the fourteenth to the seventeenth chapters, inclusive, the whole subject is occupied in conversations between Jesus and His disciples, prayers for their comfort, and assurances of His love. In the eighteenth chapter Jesus is betrayed, then arraigned, condemned, and crucified.

So that we see, from this short summary, that no mention whatever is made by S. John of the Eucharist. The supper itself is described even more minutely, and with greater circumstance, than by the other evangelists, many conversations are given which were not related in the other gospels, and yet not one word of that ceremony, which was the last, and almost dying command of our blessed Lord. Now how shall we account for this? We shall account for it by two observations:—First, S. John wrote his gospel many years after the establishment of Christianity. It is probable that his gospel was not published until the year 97, nearly thirty years after the destruction of Jerusalem. Considering the number of years in which the Christian religion had been in existence, and knowing as we do, from other parts of sacred scripture, that the Lord's Supper was then a regular and established custom, it would seem quite unnecessary that S. John should enter into any

historical account of an institution, of which there were already four historical accounts published and known among Christians. I say *four*, because the account given by S. Paul, we must always remember, was antecedent to the time of S. John. The Eucharist was at that time daily celebrated in the Christian Church. Every Christian knew what it was. The three previous gospels had amply explained its nature and its history ; and therefore S. John naturally enough passes it over—as he does many other points which are given by his brother evangelists—as a thing well known and understood. Secondly, though S. John does not mention the institution in any direct manner, yet he gives a very remarkable conversation, in which our Saviour makes allusion to it, and this conversation he describes just as a person would do in speaking of a matter already well known. In the sixth chapter, Jesus is described as saying to the Jews, “ I am the living bread which came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever : and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.”* And again, “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life ; and I will

* John vi, 51.

raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by Me. This is that bread that came down from Heaven, not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth of *this* bread shall live for ever.”* Now what can be more apposite and decided than the whole of this passage? It is related with no comment or explanation, but as a thing well known to the Christians for whom the Evangelist was writing; the flesh of Christ represented the bread, and the blood being signified by the wine in the Eucharist, and the eating and drinking of that flesh and blood causing mankind, through faith, to dwell in Christ, and Christ in them.

We take therefore the four gospels, and the Epistle of S. Paul to the Corinthians, as furnishing together the great evidence of our Sacrament of the Eucharist, and the sum of the whole amounts shortly to this:—Our Saviour knowing that He was about to be betrayed into the hands of the Jews, and foreseeing that he was about to suffer upon

* John vi, 53-58. An expression here is borrowed in our present service of the Communion. See the prayer before the consecration,—“That we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us.”

the cross an ignominious death, by which death the sins of mankind were to be remitted and forgiven, determined, before that event should take place, to leave among His disciples some ordinance or ceremony commemorative both of the death which he should die, and of the benefits to be procured by that death. He had told His disciples that His body should be broken, and His blood poured out upon the cross; He therefore took bread and brake it, and wine, and poured it out. Lastly, He commanded His followers perpetually and unceasingly to observe this ordinance, even unto the end of the world—the breaking of bread as a memorial of His broken body, the pouring out of wine as remembrance of His blood shed upon the cross. He signified to them, by mentioning the words, “*My blood of the new testament,*” that this eating and drinking the bread and wine was the sign of a new covenant between God and man, and that therefore from the time of His approaching death, the old covenant of the Jews would be at an end. The seal of the old covenant was, the “blood of bulls and goats”; but, as S. Paul says, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, “It was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin”; therefore saith Christ, a “*body*” shall be prepared as a sacrifice—a *human body*—and that sacrifice shall be, once for all, continuous and everlasting; and the blood of the

new sacrifice shall be the seal of this new covenant. The blood of Jesus, commemorated and represented in the Eucharist, shall be the sign of the new covenant between a reconciled God and his pardoned creatures. And moreover, as all through His life He had constantly alluded to the necessity of some mysterious communion between Himself and His disciples, since of *themselves* they could do nothing,—since they could neither have strength, nor faith, nor be drawn unto God, nor be justified,—so now His will and intention was, that the *means* of this necessary communion should be this very same holy ordinance. As it was necessary that Regeneration should take place, and for that an external mean was provided, namely, water—so it was necessary that the regenerated life should *continue*, and for that the bread and wine as offered up, as consecrated and made sacramental, were the means provided; thus fulfilling His own words: “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.”

What, then, is the sacrament of the Eucharist? It is this—a symbolical commemoration, instituted by Christ Himself, of the sacrifice of His death. It is, moreover, a federal act between God and man—an act by which man signifies to God his faith and obedience, and God signifies and promises to man inward and spiritual grace. And it is again, an

outward and visible mean by which the necessary indwelling of God's holy Spirit is to be communicated to the Christian; and therefore it is, as expressed in the Articles of our Church, "A badge or token of a Christian man's profession, and not only that, but a certain sure witness, and effectual sign of grace, and God's good will towards us; and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him." There is an intermixture of four distinct notions—a covenant, a sacrifice, a feast, and an act of commemoration. Neither one nor the other, by itself, could hold good; but the whole four united together define the sacrament. The notion of performing a sacrifice, and upon that sacrifice instituting a feast, and by that feast ratifying a covenant, and the whole ceremony thus constituting an act of memorial, has existed from the earliest ages.* The greatest and most remarkable instance is the Passover. There is the *sacrifice* of the lamb, and upon this

* See Genesis xxvi, 31. The covenant made between Abimelech and Isaac. See also Exod. xxxiv, 15, and 1 Samuel i, 24, where Hannah, according to her vow, offered her child Samuel unto the Lord, and it is said, "*And they slew a bullock* and brought the child to Eli." To these instances from Scripture, the classical reader will readily add abundant testimony from heathen writers; particularly he will remember, Homer's *Iliad*, Book i, 455, and iii, 290,—and, in fact, every ancient author abounds in similar testimony. So that Cudworth, in his treatise, says of paganism, that it is "nothing but Judaism degenerate."

For a more full enquiry into the above very interesting particulars, see *Cudworth*.

the eating of the lamb, which constitutes the *feast*, and then the *covenant* thereby ratified between the Israelites and God, and then the *memorial* thereby established of the deliverance from Egypt. And here the distinction arises between the usage of the Roman and the Anglican Church. The former makes the Eucharist a sacrifice of the *actual* body of Christ. Romanists affirm that the body of Jesus is again offered up to God by the hands of the priest;* but *we* affirm that it is only a *commemorative*, or *representative* sacrifice,—that Jesus has been once offered—that He can never be offered again, but that after the custom of a sacrifice, we present unto God bread and wine before His altar; and that upon that bread and wine so offered, we make a

* That I may not appear to exaggerate the errors of the Church of Rome, I quote from the Council of Trent, the three first canons of the sacrifice of the mass :

“CANON I.

“If any man shall say, that there is not offered to God in the mass, *a true and proper sacrifice*; or, if he shall say, that that which is offered, is nothing else than that Christ is given us to eat; let him be accursed.”

“CANON II.

“If any man shall say, that in the words ‘Do this in remembrance of me’, Christ did not appoint the apostles to be priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests *should offer His body and blood*; let him be accursed.”

“CANON III.

“If any man shall say, that the sacrifice of the mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice which was made upon the cross, but not propitiatory; or that it profits him alone who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be accursed.”

feast, recording the original and real sacrifice. Thus it is that S. Paul, when desirous to warn the Corinthian converts from presenting themselves at the idolatrous feasts of heathens, or from eating meat which had been offered to idols, expressly institutes a comparison between the Lord's Supper, as a sacrificial feast, and the idolatrous sacrificial feasts of the heathens. He says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?"* And then, afterwards—"Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of devils." Where the argument evidently is this: You must not, in the heathen sacrifice, partake of the feast which they celebrate; because, by so doing, you would be as much partakers, and in communion with their false worship of demons, as you are, by partaking of the cup and of the bread in the Eucharist, in communion with the blood and the body of Christ, for they are both sacrificial feasts.

While, then, we must be cautious how we fall into any notion derogatory to the dignity of this Holy

* 1 Cor. x. 16, 18.

Sacrament, by supposing it a mere act of commemoration, or a mere renewal of a former pledge between ourselves and God, we must at the same time be equally cautious lest we imagine it to be any renewal or repetition of the once offered sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The sacrifice has been made once for all. We record it in the bread and wine offered. Upon this we make a feast of joy and thanksgiving; we renew our promises to God, and God renews His promises to us; and the altar, and the priest, and the oblation, are symbolical and commemorative of the glorious privileges which Jesus purchased for us once for all at the price of His own sufferings and death.*

Lastly, as an explanation of the nature and design of the Eucharist, a very curious analogy may be traced between the passover of the Jews, and that which may very justly be called the passover of Christians. At the time our Saviour instituted the Eucharist, the Mosaic dispensation was at its close. The Holy of Holies was about to be thrown open, and man was about to be reconciled to God by the Sacrifice of His only Son. The long series of prophecies were now about to be accomplished: the types, the figures,

* For the authorities, both of the primitive fathers and doctors of our own Church, on which we rest our doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, as distinct from that of Rome, see chapter v, in which it is more particularly considered.

the offerings and sacrifices of the Levitical law were at an end. The lamb slain at the passover merely prefigured the crucifixion of the Lamb of God; the blood sprinkled on the door-post and lintel merely prefigured the blood to be sprinkled on the hearts of men by the piercing of the soldier's spear; and, inasmuch as God thought fit to shadow forth these things to mankind *before* they took place, so it seems natural that He should institute ordinances in commemoration of them, *after* they had taken place. What the passover was to the Jews, the Eucharist is to us: S. Paul expressly says, "Christ *our passover* is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

But the similarity is the more curious, the more closely we examine it. For a due participation in the passover, the previous rite of *circumcision* was demanded as essential: "no stranger was to partake thereof." For a due participation in the Eucharist, the previous Sacrament of *Baptism* is deemed essential. In the paschal supper the master of the family began the feast with a cup of wine, which he solemnly blessed. So our Saviour, before the institution of the Eucharist, at the commencement of the feast, as we read in S. Luke, "took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this and

divide it among yourselves.” In the passover, some one of the younger persons of the family, generally a child, stood forth and asked the reason of the feast; and to answer this question, the master of the family detailed the history of the destroying angel passing over the children of the Israelites. So, in just accordance with this, is the expression of Jesus in S. Paul, “For by this do ye shew forth the Lord’s death till He come”. In the passover the master of the feast rose up and washed his hands; Jesus rose up and girded Himself, and washed His disciples’ feet. In the passover, the lamb being tasted, the feast was concluded by a cup of wine, which was called the cup of blessing, because, they sanctified it, and gave thanks for it by blessing God. So also Christ, when He took the sacramental cup, gave thanks and pronounced a blessing over it. Still more, as he who wilfully refused to keep the passover, “*bore his own sin*”, and was “*cut off from Israel*”, so surely we may imply that he who neglects the Eucharist in the Christian dispensation, renounces all the benefits which are derived from the Saviour’s death, and shall, in the same way, *bear his own sins*.* And

* If the reader is desirous of pursuing this analogy with the accuracy it deserves, he is requested carefully to read the 12th chapter of the book of Exodus; and if anything of a more learned inquiry should be wished, see Cudworth’s Treatise, Adam Clarke’s Discourse, Waterland, and Lightfoot; all which authors are easy of access.

lastly, as the passover was commanded to be kept in force until the coming of the Saviour to bring the glad tidings of the gospel, so is the Eucharist to remain in force, until the second and final coming of the Saviour to judge the world. At the pass-over, the Eucharist was appointed. Then did the real Lamb take place of the typical lamb; the deliverance from sin stood in the place of the deliverance from Egypt; the promises of heaven in the place of the promises of Canaan; and thus it was truly said, “Behold the *Lamb of God* which taketh away the sins of the world.”

Let us dwell on these things, and let us acknowledge that in the paschal sacrifice there are as distinctly marked by the finger of God, the shadows of the future, as we can distinctly trace in the Eucharist sacrifice the certainty of the past. The destroying angel passed over the houses of the children of Israel, when he saw their door-posts marked by the blood of the slain lamb. We also have a Lamb; we too have a destroying angel, and we have a sign by which that destroying angel may be induced to pass us by. Only let us have our hearts sprinkled by the blood of Jesus,—only let us, as a sign of that blood, betake ourselves to His altar in faith and obedience. The Israelites might have said, “Why should not God save us, though we omit this outward sign? Inward belief is better.”

So they who imagine that they have the inward faith of the gospel, may be tempted to despise the outward sign of the Lord's Supper. But the *sign* is the very thing that God requires. It is the sprinkling of blood that the destroying angel now, as well as then, looks for, and the sign of faith to Christians is—"THE EUCHARIST." It is the sign of the covenant between them and God. Christians are, as it were, in Egypt, in bondage to death, in the wages of sin—and if they will go forth, if they will be redeemed, if while the work of death is going on among the first-born of the Egyptians, they are willing to escape, if they desire to look onwards from this miserable scene of bondage to the land of promise, a land flowing with milk and honey—then must they slay their lamb, sprinkle the door-post with his blood, eat of the flesh, yea even with bitter herbs and unleavened bread—the bitter herbs of repentance, the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth; they must have their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, their staves in their hand, as men ready for their journey. "It is the Lord's Eucharist." By that sign—the crucified Jesus—are they as Christians known; by the bread and wine, that is, the body and blood of Jesus, are they "separated from sinners, and come out from among them." These, and these only, are their passports out of the house of bondage—the tokens

of their covenant with God—the means by which they hold communion with their Redeemer; these, and these only, will be the signs of their hope, their obedience, their faith—in short their whole Christianity—when death, the destroying angel of the Lord Jehovah, shall pass over their dwellings in the day of His visitation.

Sep 80

[HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, AND S. PAUL'S
FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, RELATING
TO THE EUCHARIST.

HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, AND S. PAUL'S FIRST

<p>THE PREPARATION FOR THE PASSOVER, AND THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE ANTEPAST; OR, FIRST PART OF THE PASCHAL SUPPER.</p>	<p>S. MATTHEW. xxvi, 17-20.</p> <p>Now the first <i>day</i> of the <i>feast</i> of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?</p> <p>And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples.</p> <p>And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover.</p> <p>Now when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve.</p>	<p>S. MARK. xiv, 12-17.</p> <p>And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare, that thou mayest eat the passover?</p> <p>And he sendeth forth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him.</p> <p>And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the good man of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?</p> <p>And he will shew you a large upper room furnished <i>and</i> prepared: there make ready for us.</p> <p>And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.</p> <p>And in the evening he cometh with the twelve.</p>
<p>THE ANTEPAST, UNTIL ITS CONCLUSION.</p>		

EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, RELATING TO THE EUCHARIST.

S. LUKE.

xxii, 7-14.

Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed.

And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat.

And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare?

And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water: follow him into the house where he entereth in.

And ye shall say unto the good man of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?

And he shall show you a large upper room furnished: there make ready.

And they went and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him.

xxii, 15.

And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer:

For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves:

For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.

S. JOHN.

xiii, 1.

Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.

xiii, 2.

And supper being ended (the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him).

S. PAUL.

HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, AND S. PAUL'S FIRST

S. MATTHEW.

S. MARK.

CONTENTION
OF THE
APOSTLES
AND THE REBUKE OF
JESUS,
BY WASHING THEIR FEET.

EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, RELATING TO THE EUCHARIST.

S. LUKE.

xxii, 24-30.

And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest.

And he said unto them, The Kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors.

But ye *shall* not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.

For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? *is* not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth.

Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations:

And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me;

That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

S. JOHN.

xiii, 4-16.

He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself:

After that he poured water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe *them* with the towel wherewith he was girded.

Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter said unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet?

Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter.

Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.

Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also *my* hands and *my* head.

Jesus said unto him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash *his* feet, but is clean every whit; and ye are clean, but not all.

For he knew who should betray him: therefore said he, Ye are not all clean.

So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you?

Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for *so* I am.

If I then, *your* Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet.

For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.

S. PAUL.

HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, AND S. PAUL'S FIRST

<p>THE LAMB BROUGHT IN— THE SECOND PART OF THE PASSEOVER. THE PROPHECY OF THE BETRAYAL OF JESUS BY JUDAS ISCARIOT.</p>	<p>S. MATTHEW. xxvi, 21-25. And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth <i>his</i> hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born. Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said.</p>	<p>S. MARK. xiv, 18-21. And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, <i>Is</i> it I? and another said, <i>Is</i> it I? And he answered and said unto them, <i>It is</i> one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish. The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born.</p>
<p>INSTITUTION OF THE EUCCHARIST.</p>	<p>xxvi, 26-30. And, as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed <i>it</i>, and brake <i>it</i>, and gave <i>it</i> to the disciples, and said, TAKE, EAT; THIS IS MY BODY. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave <i>it</i> to them saying, DRINK YE ALL OF IT; For THIS IS MY BLOOD of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives.</p>	<p>xiv, 22-26. And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake <i>it</i>, and gave to them, and said, TAKE, EAT; THIS IS MY BODY. And he took the cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave <i>it</i> to them; and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, THIS IS MY BLOOD of the new testament, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God. And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives.</p>

EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, RELATING TO THE EUCHARIST.

S. LUKE.

S. JOHN.

xii, 21-26

Verily, verily, I say unto you,
That one of you shall betray
me.

Then the disciples looked
one on another, doubting of
whom he spake.

Now there was leaning on
Jesus' bosom one of his disci-
ples, whom Jesus loved.

Simon Peter therefore beck-
oned to him, that he should
ask who it should be of whom
he spake.

He then lying on Jesus'
breast, saith unto him, Lord,
who is it?

Jesus answered, He it is to
whom I shall give a sop when
I have dipped *it*. And when he
had dipped the sop, he gave *it* to
Judas Iscariot *the son of Simon*.

S. PAUL.

1 Cor. xi, 23.

For I have received of
the Lord that which also I
delivered unto you, That
the Lord Jesus the *same*
night in which he was
betrayed

xxii, 19-20.

And he took bread,
and gave thanks, and
brake *it*, and gave unto
them, saying, THIS
IS MY BODY which
is given for you:

this do in remem-
brance of me.

Likewise also the
cup after supper, say-
ing, THIS CUP IS THE
NEW TESTAMENT IN
MY BLOOD, which is
shed for you.

1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

took bread:

And when he had given
thanks, he brake *it*, and
said, TAKE, EAT: THIS
IS MY BODY, which is
broken for you: this do
in remembrance of me.

After the same manner
also *he took* the cup, when
he had supped, saying,
THIS CUP IS THE NEW
TESTAMENT IN MY BLOOD:
this do ye, as oft as ye
drink *it*, in remembrance
of me.

For as often as ye eat
this bread, and drink this
cup, ye do show the Lord's
death till he come.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY : FROM ITS FIRST APPOINTMENT TO THE
CLOSE OF THE SIXTH CENTURY.

1 COR. XI, 26.

For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew
the Lord's death *till he come*.

WE have now seen the *nature* and *design* of the institution of the Eucharist, and the particular circumstances which attended its appointment. From this we are naturally led to consider the reception which it met with throughout the world, and to see how mankind, having received this solemn charge from their Saviour, followed it up in their religious practice. For this purpose we shall endeavour to ascertain first, how it flourished in its primitive simplicity in the apostolic times : then, how it gradually became corrupted, under the papal dominion, by the doctrine of transubstantiation, and various other errors of the Roman Church ; and lastly we shall trace it onwards to the reviving light of the Reformation, when it was

restored by the fathers of our own Church to its present form and ritual:—

THE FIRST CENTURY.

Our Saviour instituted the Eucharist, as we have already seen, in the city of Jerusalem, on the last evening of His life. In the city of Jerusalem, therefore, we should expect to hear of its first celebration. Turning to the Acts of the Apostles, we shall accordingly find the first mention of this Sacrament on the day of Pentecost, ten days after the Ascension of our Lord. We do not find any lengthened or studied account; we do not find it even asserted that it was the first time at which it had been observed. It is described quite as an accidental and casual circumstance, as though it had been a thing well known among Christians, and therefore not needing any lengthened or elaborate detail. Three thousand souls had been added to the Church by the eloquent sermon of S. Peter. This was the infant Church of Christ,—three thousand faithful and devoted followers of a crucified Lord: and in describing the general manners of these three thousand, their habits of devotion, and their way of life, S. Luke speaks thus: “And they continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread*, and in prayers.” And again, shortly afterwards: “And they con-

tinuing with one accord in the temple, and *breaking bread* from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.”* This breaking of bread can have no possible reference to anything except the Eucharist. It is the general way in which the apostles mention it, and is universally allowed to refer to that institution. The next mention which is made of it is in the twentieth chapter of the Acts and seventh verse: “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to *break bread*, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow.” Here the apostle seems to assert that it was the custom of those times to celebrate this “breaking of bread”, on the first day of every week. He does not say that the disciples came together to break bread, as on a special occasion, but “*when*” the disciples came together, inferring evidently that it was their weekly custom so to do. The time to which S. Luke refers in this passage is about the year 56, and the time at which the book of the Acts was finished was the year 64. Therefore we have from this passage an evidence of the weekly celebration of the Lord’s Supper for nearly thirty years after the crucifixion. In corroboration of this, let us now turn to S. Paul. S. Paul wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians in

* Acts ii, 42, 46.

the year 56. In the eleventh chapter of that epistle he says, “When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord’s Supper”; and then he proceeds to describe certain errors of which the Church of Corinth had been guilty in their manner of its celebration. In the tenth chapter of the same epistle, he says: “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table, and of the table of devils.” From these two passages, we see, that the Lord’s Supper was an established ordinance of the Church of Corinth, and as he does not address them as at all peculiar in having this ordinance, we may reasonably infer that not only the Church of Corinth, but all the Churches founded by the apostles, possessed at that time a regular established celebration of this Sacrament. Then, advancing further to the gospel of S. John, who alludes to this Sacrament as a thing well known and understood;—“Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life”;*—and again, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you”;†—and considering that S. John’s Gospel was published the last of all the Scriptures, and quite at the close of the first century, we have, it must be allowed, a clear and conclusive proof of a continued observance

* John vi, 54.

† John vi, 53.

of the Lord's Supper, on the part of the apostolic Churches, for at least one hundred years.

As to any writings in this century beyond the Scriptures themselves, our testimony is but scanty. The only fathers whose works are extant are S. Barnabas, S. Clement, and Hermas. S. Clement was bishop of Rome in the year 96 ; many epistles are attributed to him, but the only one on which we can place any certain reliance as genuine, is his first epistle to the Corinthians. In this epistle we find many scattered allusions to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper under the notion of "*the oblation*" or "*liturgy*". He says, "We ought to do every thing in order as the Lord has commanded, in the appointed seasons, *to perform the oblations and liturgies*. Those who make their oblations in the appointed times are blessed"; and again, "Let each of you, brethren, give thanks [literally '*make his Eucharist*'] in his own order, with a good conscience, not transgressing the appointed canon of his liturgy".

Further than this we have no opportunity of knowing whether there were any specific doctrines or ceremonies maintained among the Christians of the Apostolic age ; *i.e.* any specific doctrines as to those points which were afterwards to create such dissension in the Church. In what sense the presence of our Lord was considered in the bread and

wine; whether there was any offering in the sense of sacrifice; what were the words of consecration and prayer; what were the actions or words of the priest;—in all this, though we may justly infer what the doctrines and customs of that early age must have been, from what we see in the ages immediately after—yet as far as our testimony reaches for the first century, we have no authority for speaking. It was most likely little more than meeting together, collecting alms, offering them up with prayer to God, then breaking bread and eating, pouring out wine and drinking, in the name and memory of Jesus. At any rate if there *had* been anything peculiar, anything in the ceremonial part of the Sacrament, vital to its existence, S. Paul, when commenting on the faults of the Corinthians, would surely have taken the opportunity of mentioning it. From the charges which he has delivered, we may infer, that simplicity, regularity, and devotion, formed the basis of its celebration, and that as long as they preserved the end and object of their Redeemer's command, "This do in remembrance of me", they were not scrupulous or contentious upon the outward forms, provided only those outward forms were observed in decency and in order, and bore respect to the high and holy mysteries which they embodied.

THE SECOND CENTURY.

After the close of the first century, we can of course have no further evidence from Scripture ; our evidence from this period will depend upon the apostolical and primitive Fathers of the Church, and such profane historians as may mention the subject from time to time.

At the commencement of the second century, or perhaps at the close of the first, Ignatius,* bishop of Antioch, in an epistle which he wrote to the Ephesians, exhorts them to be diligent in assembling together to celebrate the Eucharist. “Hasten therefore”, he says, “to meet together frequently at the Eucharist for the glory of God, for when you are continually met together, the powers of Satan are destroyed, and his fiery darts which were meant for sin turn back harmless ; your concord and unanimity of faith is his destruction, and those who are joined together in faith are his annoyance ; for nothing is better than peace in Christ, in which every warfare is rendered vain, both of things of the air, and things of the earth, for our resisting is ‘ not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness

* IGNATIUS, one of the apostolic Fathers, educated under the apostles S. John and S. Peter. He suffered martyrdom about the year 107, being devoured by wild beasts, by the order of the Emperor Trajan.

of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places'."* And again the same father says in his epistle to the Philadelphians: "There is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of His blood, one Altar, as there is one Bishop together with the Presbytery and Deacons."†

A little after Ignatius, Pliny the younger, a Roman magistrate, pro-consul of Bithynia, examined some Christian converts on the subject of their faith and way of life. His attention was directed to them, by their meeting together early in the morning before the light of day. These are the words which he uses in a letter to the Emperor Trajan: "They affirm that the whole sum of that sect, or error, lay in this,—that they were wont upon a set solemn day to meet together before sunrise, and to sing among themselves a hymn to Christ as God, and to oblige themselves by a *sacrament* not to commit any wickedness, but to abstain from theft, robbery, adultery; to keep faith, and to restore any pledge entrusted to them; and after that, they retired, and met again at a common meal, in which was nothing extraordinary or criminal."‡

In the same century, about the year 150, Justin Martyr§ gives the following description: "Prayers

* Ignatius, Epist. ad Ephes. † Idem: Epist. ad Philadelphios.

‡ Plin. lib. x, Ep. 97.

§ JUSTIN MARTYR, the second, in point of chronology, of the primitive Fathers, excepting the apostolical.—A.D. 140. He studied

being finished, we greet one another with mutual embraces; then bread, and a cup of water, mixed with wine,* is offered to him who presides over the brethren; when he has received them, he gives *praise and glory* to the Father of all, in the name of the Son and Holy Ghost, and pursues at some length the Eucharistia, or giving of thanks, because God has thought us worthy of such gifts: when he has finished these prayers and giving of thanks, all

the philosophy of the Platonic school, until converted to Christianity, and suffered martyrdom in the reign of Marcus Antoninus.

* The Church of England differs on this point from the primitive usage, which unquestionably was to mix water with the wine in the celebration of the Eucharist. The Council of Trent decrees, "that the priests are to mix water with the wine, both because it is believed that Christ did so, and also because from His side water came out with the blood; which sacrament is had in remembrance by this mixture." Would that the Council of Trent had been in every point as correct as in this; for beyond question it must have been a cup of water and wine that our Lord consecrated, that being the custom of the Jewish passover; for this see Justin Martyr as above, Irenæus, and Clemens Alexandrinus; and even the Church of England, though she has at present given up this usage, yet originally in her practice agreed with the Church of Rome. See Liturgy of King Edward VI. See also further observations on this in chap. v.

Turretin defends our present practice, and quotes Matt. xxvi, 29, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine", arguing that there is no mention of the water in the divine command, confessing, however, that "water *was* mixed with wine by the ancients, because the use of pure wine was rare among the eastern nations;" and Bingham says, that the Armenians consecrated only in wine, and that it was reckoned an error in them by Theophylact, and condemned by the Council of Trullo. Yet, after all, as there is no express command for this in the institution, notwithstanding this general consent of the ancient Church, it is commonly determined by modern divines, as well of the Roman as of the Anglican Church, that it is not essential to the sacrament itself, as the reader that is curious may find demonstrated in Vossius, in his dissertation upon the subject. See *Vossius, Thes. Theol.* p. 494. *Bingham Ecc. Antiq.* book xv, sec. 7.

the people say, in joyful assent, ‘Amen.’ When the president has performed this giving of thanks, and the people have assented to them by their prayers, those persons who are called deacons and ministers, distribute the bread and wine, mixed with water, over which the thanks have been given, to every one present, and they then carry it to the absent. This food is called by us ‘*the Eucharist*’, and no one is allowed to partake of it, but he who believes our doctrine to be true, and has been washed in the bath (of Baptism) for the remission of sins and regeneration, and who lives as Christ has commanded.”* And then afterwards he goes on thus: “For the Apostles, in the commentaries written by them, which are called Gospels, have handed down that Jesus made the institution in this manner: when He had given thanks, He received the bread, and said, ‘Do this in remembrance of me; this is my body;’ and in the same manner when He had received the cup, He said, ‘This is my blood’. We indeed call these things mutually to memory, and in all the oblations which we offer, we praise, with blessing, the Creator of all, through His Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit; and on that day which is Sunday, all who live in towns, or in the country, meet together, and the commentaries of the Apostles, or the writings of the Prophets,

* Justin Martyr, Apol. 2, pp. 97 and 98.

as the time permits, are read. Then, when the reader has finished, the president delivers an oration, in which he instructs the people, and encourages them to imitate things so delightful. After this we all rise up in common, and pour forth our prayers, and when the prayers are over, bread is brought forward, and wine mixed with water; and a distribution and communion is made to every one present of these elements, over which the thanks have been given, and they are sent to the absent by the deacons. They also who are rich and are willing, each according to his own will, contributes as seems good to him, and the collection is deposited in the hands of the president: from this source he affords assistance to orphans and widows, and those who, on account of disease or any other cause, are in want, or in prison; or, to sum up all in one word, the president is the guardian of all indigent persons." Nothing can possibly be more full, or more satisfactory, than this account of the Lord's Supper, as it was observed about the middle of the second century; nothing also can be more similar to our own method of celebrating it at present, making reasonable allowance for the change of time and manners.

But we have still further references: Irenæus,*

* IRENÆUS, A.D. 178, was a disciple of Polycarp, and Polycarp a disciple of S. John; so that we have in him a direct apostolical

in the middle of the second century, in describing the Eucharist, writes as follows: "We offer unto Him (God) His own gifts, thereby declaring the communication and truth both of flesh and spirit; for as the bread which is of the earth is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two parts, the one earthly, the other heavenly, so all our bodies receiving the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, whilst they live in hopes of a resurrection; but we offer these things to Him not as if He stood in need of them, but as giving Him thanks for His gifts, and sanctifying the creature." And again he says: "Christ directing His disciples to offer unto God the first fruits of His creatures, took the creature of bread, and gave thanks, saying, 'This is my body;' and likewise He confessed the cup to be His blood, teaching the oblation of the New Testament, which *the Church, receiving from the apostles, offereth to God throughout the world.*"* So also Clement of Alexandria:† "The blood of the Lord is twofold. For in one sense it is fleshly, by which we are freed from corruption, in the other spiritual, by which we are anointed; and this it is to drink the blood of Christ, to partake of the puri-

communication. He was Bishop of Lyons, in France, and suffered martyrdom, A.D. 202.

* Irenæus, adv. Hæres, lib. iv, c. 32.

† CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, A.D. 194, originally a heathen philosopher, afterwards a presbyter of Alexandria.

fication of the Lord; and the mixture of these, that is, of the drink and of the word, is called the Eucharist, an admirable and beautiful grace, of which those who partake in faith, are made holy in body and soul." And the same author again: "Christ blessed the wine, and said, 'Take it, and drink: this is my blood,'—the holy stream of the Church—the Word poured forth for the remission of sins."

THE THIRD CENTURY.

Here we find Tertullian* about the year 220, thus speaking: "Every one offers a small alms monthly, or when he will, or as he can, for no one is compelled, but he makes a voluntary oblation. It is not expended in feasting, drinking, and abusive excesses, but in feeding and burying the poor, in providing for orphans and aged people, and such as suffer shipwreck or languish in the mines, or in banishment, or in prison. Only one part of it is spent upon a sober *feast of charity*, where the poor has a right to feed as well as the rich."† And to shew that as yet no change from the simple doctrine of our Redeemer was at all ventured upon, he says, in another place, "The bread being received and distributed to His disciples, He made

* TERTULLIAN flourished towards the end of the second century and commencement of the third; he was originally a heathen, but when converted to Christianity is not known.

† Tertull. Apol. c. 39.

it His body by saying, ‘This is my body’, that is ‘*The figure of my body*’.”*

Again, Origen,† in the year 230, thus asserts: “We eat the bread that was offered to the Creator with prayer and thanksgiving for the gifts that He has bestowed upon us, which bread is made a holy body by prayer, sanctifying those that use it with a pious mind.”‡

In another place, commenting on the words “Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man,” he says, “It is not the matter of the bread, but the word which is spoken over it, which profits him that eats it worthily, and this, indeed, as a typical and symbolical body.”§

Again, commenting on the Old Testament, he goes out of his way to refer to the New Testament, for the purpose of disproving any notion but that of simply and spiritually eating the sacred elements; and he says, “There is also in the New Testament, the letter which kills him who does not spiritually understand it. For if you follow this command, ‘Unless you eat my flesh, and drink my blood’, according to the letter, this letter kills; but if you understand it spiritually, it does not kill,

* Contr. Marc. lib. iv.

† ORIGEN,—born at Alexandria, a pupil of Clement before mentioned, a catechist of Alexandria, and afterwards presbyter. One of the most illustrious of the fathers. Died at Tyre, A.D. 254.

‡ Origen contra Celsum, lib. viii, p. 399.

§ Origen, Matt. xv, 11.

but there is a vivifying spirit in it.”* Once more, in his commenting on the words, “Take, eat; this is my body,”† he says, “For God, the Word, did not call that visible bread which He held in His hands, His body; but the word in the *mystery* of which that bread was to be broken; nor did He call that visible drink His blood; but the word in the *mystery* of which that drink was to be poured forth.”

Another father of this century, S. Cyprian,‡ is equally conclusive as to the practice and opinions of the Church. Addressing a rich woman, who had neglected to make an offering, he says: “You are rich and wealthy, and think that you celebrate the Lord’s Supper, yet do not at all respect the corban. You come to the Lord’s Supper without a sacrifice; you take away a part of the sacrifice which the poor has offered.”§ The same father, in his epistle to Cæcilianus, speaks of mixing water with the wine,|| and mentions the reasons for which it was done: “We see, that in the water the people are

* Levit. Hom. vii.

† Matt. xxvi, 26.

‡ S. CYPRIAN.—An African, born at Carthage, supposed to have been converted to Christianity A.D. 246, and made bishop of Carthage A.D. 248. Being commanded by the Emperor Valerian to offer sacrifice to the gods, which was the usual test of denying Christianity, S. Cyprian answered, “*I will not.*” The pro-consul, by the command of the Emperor, said, “*It is decreed that Cyprian shall be beheaded.*” To which the excellent bishop replied, “*God be praised:*” he was then beheaded, A.D. 258.

§ Cyprian, de Oper. and Eleemos.

|| See the note upon Justin Martyr, quoted at p. 41.

represented, but in the wine the blood of Christ; and when in the cup the water is mixed with wine, the people is made one with Christ; and the believers and He in whom they believe are joined and mixed: so in the cup of the Lord, water alone cannot be offered, nor wine alone, for if any one should offer wine alone, the blood of Christ is without us; but if water alone, the people are without Christ: but when each is mutually joined by a pouring together, and making one, then a spiritual and heavenly sacrifice is performed.”*

In another epistle, the same father says: “When the Lord calls His body bread, which is made up of the union of many seeds, He indicates that the people are in union; and when He calls His blood wine, extracted from many bunches of grapes, and pressed into one, He signifies the flock joined together by the mixture of a multitude in union.”† In the same epistle he again refers to it: “Likewise it appears, that the blood of Christ is not offered if there is no wine in the cup, nor is the Lord’s sacrifice celebrated with legitimate consecration, unless our offering and sacrifice answer to His passion: but how shall we drink the new wine of the creation of the vine with Christ, in the kingdom of His Father, if in the sacrifice of God the Father, and of Christ, we do not offer the wine,

* Cyprian, Ep. ad Cæcil.

† Cyprian. Ep. Carthag.

nor mix the cup of the Lord according to the Lord's tradition?"

It is true indeed that there are one or two heretical opinions which prevailed about this time, which in some way detract from the unanimity of the Christian world, such as the following: the Hydroparastatæ, or Aquarians,* who thought it was wrong to use wine in the Eucharist, and, as their name imports, consecrated water in its stead; also the Marcosians,† who commenced at the latter part of the second century, taking their name from Marcus, a disciple of the Valentinian heresy; Marcus was reported, amongst other infamous practices, to be expert in tricks of legerdemain and magic, and these he used to carry on, for the sake of acquiring notoriety, in the sacrament of the Eucharist. Irenæus says of him, "Pretending that he was giving thanks for the wine mixed in the chalice, and very much prolonging the words of his invocation, he made the wine appear of a purple or a red colour, so that it might appear that Christ's blood was dropped into the chalice in consequence of his invocation." But with the exception of these and similar absurdities, which were expressly called heretical, and therefore denote the general opinion of the Church, we may safely say, that for the three first centuries, the sacrament of

* See Bingham, *Eccl. Antiq.* Book xv, Sect. 7.

† See Echard, *Eccl. Hist.*, and Mosheim.

the Eucharist was preserved in the pure and simple state, both in practice and doctrine, in which our Lord ordained it. We have sufficient testimony from the fathers above quoted, that notwithstanding the violent persecutions which the Christians continually suffered at this period, and the many heresies which arose throughout the Church on *other* points, still the sacrament of the Eucharist maintained its ground, and was considered as the Lord's ordinance, free from all superstitious ceremonies.

How easy and natural the transition is from the Scriptures to the fathers; from the Acts of the Apostles, and S. Paul, and S. Luke, to Ignatius, Irenæus, and Justin Martyr; how convincingly the Church stands before us, carried on step by step—the inspired writings ceasing, the uninspired writing commencing—with the holy Eucharist before them all as the great sacrament of the Christian.

The principal value of the investigation of this History is this—in the quiet unassuming way in which the great mystery is spoken of, it seems taken for granted. There is no set argument about it; it is alluded to, illustrated, taken up as a thing well understood, as *the* great mystery of the faith, that by which Christians were to be known, that by which the peculiar grace of Christianity was to be conferred, that without which no

one could remain or be a Christian; for if the Lord's body when actually in the flesh were a blessing to behold, if the Lord's blood really had been a wonderful mystery to see poured forth upon the cross, so it was a blessing now to them to have this sacrament, and a mystery now to them who could not (as time went on), any longer see Him in act hanging on the tree, or in deed shedding His blood.

But this was the Christian faith; that in His body we should live, and by His blood we should be cleansed. How live, if we realized it not? how be cleansed, if we drank of it not? Now the Apostles might have *seen and believed*. "Blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed." S. John *saw*, Irenæus was a disciple of S. John, he *might* have *seen*, but probably did not. Cyprian, Tertullian, Origen *could* not have seen, yet they heard from Irenæus, as Irenæus from S. John, as S. John from our Lord; and though not seeing, "they *believed*". And thus, each in his own place and to his own generation set forth the crucified *body*, and the shed *blood*, in the bread and wine, as our Lord commanded, handing it down and shewing it to their successors, even to this day.

We have come to the close of the third century. When we remember what those centuries were in the annals of the Church, the bitter persecutions

which on all sides the disciples of the Lord endured; how their forms of worship were necessarily secret and hasty, performed by night in dens and caverns of earth; in the forests; in momentary peril of life: then indeed it is wonderful to us how the Eucharistic feast was so faithfully maintained, as, from the testimony of these fathers, we behold it. It must have been something very dear to them. Let us remember too that not only was there persecution from the heathen without, but also heresies troubled the Church, even in those early times, within; but still through all, according to the promise of our Lord, He was with His Church. *Daily* in many places, *weekly* in all, and specially on the Lord's day, or Sunday, so peculiarly suitable to this great feast, did the faithful ever meet together "to break bread." It was the essence of their worship. In the prayers and consecration of the feast, they blessed God, and gave thanks for His *resurrection*, while they offered to Him, *of his own*, for alms to supply the needy and the poor. In the bread and in the wine they beheld in faith the Lord's body and the Lord's blood. Without inquiring *how* it was, they ate of the bread and drank of the wine as conveying to them in *reality*, but after a heavenly and spiritual manner, the body and blood of Jesus Christ their Lord.

THE FOURTH CENTURY.

We now come to a period most important in the history of the Church. At the commencement of this century, the Christian religion not only was freed from the long succession of persecutions, with which it had before been nearly overwhelmed, but it even became the religion of the state ; and a Roman Emperor, one of the most powerful and politic that ever guided the sceptre of the imperial realm, became first its advocate, and afterwards its professor. The first of these events may be dated at A.D. 313, the latter at A.D. 324. The close of this century was equally important, for though at first Christianity was only tolerated, and took but its share in the opinion of mankind ; in the reign of Theodosius, about the year 380, we find its advancement so rapid, and its hold on the people so secure, that by a royal edict the Christian religion was prescribed as the only true religion, the worship of idols forbidden, and the pagan temples of the Roman gods subverted and abolished. But though Christianity thus gained in political power and importance, it was beginning to lose in spiritual sincerity ; it was beginning to be divided by schisms and dissensions upon points of mystery and faith, and the root of those perversions of the gospel and of simplicity, was now planted, which was soon to grow up into

papal domination, and temporal tyranny. "The rites and institutions by which the Greeks, Romans, and other nations, had formerly testified their religious veneration for fictitious deities, were now adopted, with some slight alterations, by Christian bishops. Hence it happened that in these times the religion of the Greeks and Romans differed very little in its external appearance from that of the Christians. They had both a most pompous and splendid ritual. Gorgeous robes, mitres, tiaras, wax tapers, crosiers, processions, lustrations, images, gold and silver vases; and many such circumstances of pageantry were equally to be seen in the heathen temples and in the Christian churches."* In the midst of these dangers, it was not likely that the sacrament of the Eucharist should altogether escape: we accordingly find many signs of approaching changes; and, though these changes were as yet hardly visible, still they point, with a very clear finger, to those great errors of the church of Rome which were afterwards to follow. "It appears by innumerable testimonies, that the Lord's Supper was administered in some places two or three times in a week, in others on Sunday only, to all those who were assembled to worship God. It was also sometimes celebrated at the tombs of martyrs, and at funerals, which custom

* Mosheim, vol. i, p. 351.

undoubtedly gave rise to the *masses*, that were afterwards performed in honour of the saints, and for the benefit of the dead. In many places the bread and wine were holden up to view before their distribution, that they might be seen by the people, and contemplated with religious respect; and hence, not long after, the adoration of the symbols.”*

We may here introduce with some degree of certainty the ancient Liturgies. Liturgies were in existence in the early ages of Christianity much before this period, for we have every reason to think that in Antioch and Jerusalem there had been liturgies as early as the second century. We find liturgies bearing the names of S. James and S. Mark; and though we cannot with any safety attribute them to those actual apostles, still we may assign to them a very great antiquity.† In the fourth century we have positive testimony of

* Mosheim, vol. i, p. 357.

† “When I reflect on the vast extent of these countries, the independence of the churches which existed there, the power which each bishop had of improving the Liturgy of his church, the circumstantial varieties which we find between the liturgies of these churches, and yet the substantial identity of all; it seems to me difficult, if not impossible, to account for this identity and uniformity in any other manner than by supposing that *the apostles themselves* had originated the oriental Liturgy, and communicated it to all those churches at their very foundation. The uniformity between these liturgies, as extant in the fourth or fifth century, is such as bespeaks a common origin. Their diversity is such as to prove the remoteness of the period at which they were originated. To what remote period can we refer as exhibiting a perfect general uniformity of liturgy, except to the

their existence, at any rate of those used in the three principal Churches of Christendom. In these liturgies, as might be expected, we find many rites and ceremonies detailed, and many forms of prayer which immediately point out to us the preservation of the holy Eucharist, as the principal worship of Christians. In Antioch, we find the liturgy of S. James. In Cæsarea we find the liturgy of S. Basil.* In Constantinople we find the liturgy of S. Chrysostom.† We have also in this century the “Apostolic Constitutions”, which describe to us many points of great value; a book whose date is generally considered by the learned to be somewhat prior to the Council of Nice, A.D. 325.

From these liturgies let us now proceed to make some extracts.

In the Apostolical Constitutions, we find the following as one of the prayers. “To Thee our King and God, we offer this bread and this cup,

apostolic age. Let us remember also that existing documents of the second century enable us to trace this Liturgy to that period, and that in the time of Justin Martyr [see the first century in this work] the Christian Church was only removed by one link from the apostles themselves.”—Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. i, sect. iii.

* Basil, commonly called the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea. Opposed to the Arians. Died, A.D. 379.

† CHRYSOSTOM, John, surnamed Chrysostom (golden mouth) on account of his eloquence, Archbishop of Constantinople, A.D. 398. The empress Eudoxia having set up an image near the church, Chrysostom lifted up his voice against the abomination. On account of this he suffered much persecution, was driven into exile, and died in his sixtieth year, the brightest ornament of the Christian Church.

according to Christ's institution, giving thanks to Thee through Him, because Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee."* In S. James's Liturgy we find it thus: "Send Thy Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, that He may make this bread the life-giving body, and that He may make what is mixed in the cup the blood of the new covenant."† In the Liturgy of S. Basil, we find it thus: "We approach Thy holy altar, and having set before Thee the antitypes of the body and blood of Thy Christ, we pray and beseech Thee, according to the good pleasure of Thy benevolence, that Thy Holy Spirit may come upon us, and upon these gifts lying before Thee, to bless and to sanctify them."‡ In the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom the words are these: "We offer unto Thee this rational and unbloody service, beseeching Thee to send thy Holy Spirit upon us and these gifts. Make the bread the precious body of Thy Christ, and that which is in the cup the precious blood of Thy Christ, transmuting them by thy Holy Spirit, that they may be to the receivers, for the washing of their souls, for pardon of sins, for the participation of the Holy Ghost, for obtaining the kingdom of Heaven."§

* Apostol. Constitut. lib. viii, c. 12, p. 403.

† Liturgia Jacob. Renaudot. tom. 11, p. 33.

‡ Liturg. Basilii Græc. Gour. Ritual Græc. p. 168.

§ Chris. Liturg. t. 4, p. 614.

But in addition to these liturgies which go under the name of Basil and Chrysostom, we have also many other testimonies. In S. Chrysostom's homilies, in commenting on the words of our Lord, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" he says, "We also, in offering the cup, recite the ineffable mercies and kindness of God, and all the good things we enjoy; and so we offer it, and *communicate*, giving Him thanks for that He hath delivered mankind from error, that He hath made us near who were far off, that when we were without hope, and without God in the world, He hath made us the brethren of Christ, and fellow-heirs with Him. For these and all the like blessings, we give Him thanks, and so come to His *holy table*."* And the Council of Antioch, which was held in the year 341,† gives as one of the canons, the following very strong remark upon the necessity of all persons communicating in the sacrament: "All such as come into the house of God and hear the holy Scriptures read, but do not communicate with the people in prayer, and refuse to partake of the *Eucharist*, (which is a disorderly practice), ought to be cast out of the Church."‡

* Chrys. Hom. in 1 Cor. p. 532.

† Greg. Nyss. Orat. Catech. c. 37.

‡ Conc. Antioch. can. 2. In the Church where S. Chrysostom presided, some persons happened to remain during the

From the above passages we sufficiently see that the sacrament of the Eucharist, as to essential doctrines, still maintained its place in the general body of the Church. Many superstitious observances, might, no doubt, have been originated in this century; and we have one very remarkable writer, Cyril of Jerusalem,* who enters into some detail as to the ceremonies which seem to have been in use at that period. In what is called his *Mystagogic Catechetical Discourses*, he gives the following directions: "When the priest says, 'Taste, and see how good the Lord is', the persons receiving the bread are to open their hands, place the left on the right, keeping the fingers closely attached to each other, for fear of letting the smallest crumb

Communion Service, and yet would not communicate. Upon which S. Chrysostom addressed them thus: "Are you unworthy of the sacrifice, and unfit to partake of it?—neither then are you worthy of the prayers. Do you not hear the herald proclaiming, 'All ye that are penitents withdraw!' All they that do not communicate are penitents."

The people were divided into two classes. They were either fit to be communicants, and therefore were in duty bound so to be—or they were unfit, and therefore penitents. Would that there were but these two classes in our Church of England.—See Bingham, and Chrys. Hom. in Ephes.

* CYRIL OF JERUSALEM. Ordained presbyter, A.D. 344, and bishop, 350. Deposed three times from his see, but ultimately restored by the Council of Constantinople in 381, and died in the year 386.

Waterland had so high an opinion of Cyril, that he says, "I do not know any one writer among the ancients who has given a fuller, or clearer, or in the main, juster, account of the holy Eucharist, than this the elder Cyril has done."—*Waterland's Review*.

See the observations given in a note at page 67, on the writings of S. Ambrose.

fall; and after eating they are to bow down the head as in adoration, and then drink off the cup: while their lips are moist with the wine, they are to apply their hands to them, touch their foreheads, eyes, and ears, with their wet fingers, and finally, to render thanks to God for being permitted to partake of this holy communion.”* And not only in ceremonies, but also in doctrine, this author may seem to convey at first sight many questionable assertions. He certainly does explain, more strongly than any writer of his time, the nature of the sacramental elements; for thus he speaks: “Consider them (the elements) not as mere bread and wine; for by our Lord’s express declaration they are the body and blood of Christ; and though your *taste* may suggest that they are bread and wine, yet let your faith keep you firm. Judge not of the thing by your *taste*, but, under a full persuasion of *faith*, be you undoubtedly assured that you are vouchsafed the body and blood of Christ.”† Now these are certainly very strong expressions, and, coupled with the directions above cited, as to applying the wine to the ears, eyes, and so forth, we might be led to suppose that the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation was now commencing. But we must place passage against

* Cyril of Jerusalem, Myst. Cat. iv. and v.

† Cyr. of Jerus. Myst. Cat. iv. and v.

passage; and, most fortunately, there is another very remarkable expression in the same author, which will immediately set us right; for he says in the very same work, “ We receive the Eucharist with all fulness of faith, as the body and blood of Christ. For under the *type* of bread you have His body given you, and under the *type* of wine you receive His blood, that so partaking of the body and blood of Christ, you may become flesh of His flesh, and blood of His blood.”* Here there is evidently nothing more than the spiritual communion intended; and therefore, it is but fair to infer, that in the former quotation, the expressions, though strong, are nothing more than that figurative and hyperbolical way of speaking, which the fathers delighted to use.

But whatever may have been the opinions of S. Cyril, we have abundant testimony from other quarters that the general body of the Church still continued in the orthodox faith. In addition to the authors already cited, we have Eusebius,† who expresses himself as follows: “ Christ Himself gave to His disciples the symbols of a divine ceremony, commanding them to make a representation of His

* Cyr. of Jerus. Myst. Cat. iv.

† EUSEBIUS,—born probably at Cæsarea, and bishop of that see, A.D. 320. Origen excepted, he was the most learned and laborious of all the writers of antiquity, and in quantity surpassed even Origen. His ecclesiastical history is the work by which he is best known.—*Eusebius*, lib. viii. *Demonstr. Evang.*

body, for when He no longer wished us to give heed to bloody sacrifices, nor to those which were sanctioned in the law of Moses, in the slaying of different animals, He commanded us to use bread as a *symbol* of His own body, and thereby suitably signified the splendour and purity of this food."

We have also Athanasius:* "For this reason He made mention of the ascent of the Son of man into heaven, that He might draw them away from an understanding which had reference to the body, and that they might learn that the flesh which He spake of, was food from heaven, and *spiritual* nourishment."

Again, S. Chrysostom: although in the liturgy which bears his name he speaks of "making the bread the precious body of Christ, and that which is in the cup, the precious blood"; yet in the following passage he immediately sets us right, by shewing that no doctrine of transubstantiation is thereby conveyed: "Before the bread is sanctified we call it bread, but the divine grace sanctifying it, through the mediation of the priest, it is freed from the appellation of bread, and is thought worthy of the name of the Lord's body, *although the nature of bread has continued in it.*"†

* ATHANASIUS, A.D. 326. This father is known principally for his defence against Arius; he was cruelly persecuted by the Arians during the forty-six years of his episcopacy; he was deposed no less than five times, but he at last died peaceably in the year 373.—*Athanasius*, ii, 979.

† Chrysost. ad Cæsar. contr. Appollinarem.

Again we have Epiphanius,* who compares the water of Baptism with the bread of the Eucharist. He says, “The virtue of the bread, and the efficacy of the water, receive their power from Christ, so that it is not the bread which becomes of virtue to us, but it is the *virtue* of the bread; for the bread itself is food, but the virtue which is in it tends to the generation of life.”†

Again we have Gregory of Nyssa,‡ who explains and illustrates his notion of the divine food, by comparing it with an altar, and with a priest; for he says, “This holy altar at which we stand is a common stone by nature, but when it is consecrated to the worship of God it is immaculate. The bread also is at the beginning common bread, but when the mystery has made it holy, it is the body of Christ, and *is called so*.”§ And then he instances the man who as a layman is common, but when dedicated to God becomes holy, though not changed either in body or form.

Again we have Ambrose,|| who in discussing

* EPIPHANIUS at first embraced the monastic life, and passed several years in the desert of Egypt; A.D. 367, he was chosen Bishop of Constantia; he lived to the year 403.

† Epiph. Anaceph. Heres. tom. ii, lib. iii.

‡ GREGORY OF NYSSA, the younger brother of Basil the Great, A.D. 370; he was at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 394, and probably died soon after.

§ Gregory of Nyssa. In Bapt. xi, Orat. p. 802.

|| AMBROSE, born A.D. 340, of a consular family, was appointed bishop before he was baptized; was baptized Nov. 30, A.D. 374, and consecrated Bishop of Milan a week after.

the nature of sacraments, makes the following question: "What is the word of Christ? That by which all things were made. The Lord commanded and the heaven was made: The Lord commanded and the earth was made: The Lord commanded and every creature was made. If, therefore, there is such a force in the word of the Lord Jesus, that those things began to be which were not, how much more is He the operating cause, that those things *should be what they were* and yet *be changed into something else*. Perhaps you say I do not see the form of wine. But it has the *similitude*." And though he certainly is very strong in some of his expressions, for instance, — "Therefore you have learnt that from the bread is made the body of Christ, and that the wine and water is poured into the cup, but it is made blood by the consecration of the heavenly word", — yet I think that he has no further meaning than is conveyed by our own doctrine of the Church of England,* and that the

* In the articles of 1552 it is indeed asserted "A faithful man ought not either to believe, or openly confess, the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper"; but this was afterwards withdrawn. and it is now said, in order that we may not exclude the *spiritual* presence, "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner", art. xxviii. And in our Church Catechism, to the question, "What is the inward part or thing signified?" the answer is, "The body and blood of Christ which are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." And so Jeremy Taylor,

change that is wrought in the elements is only a *spiritual* change, not a material one. Such must be his meaning, because in other places he is perfectly decided upon this point; for instance, “In eating and drinking the flesh and the blood, we signify the things which have been offered for us. You receive the sacrament in a *similitude*; it is the *figure* of the body and blood of the Lord, and you drink the *likeness* of His precious blood.”*

Last of all, we have S. Augustine.† In quoting the words of S. John, “Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you”, he comments thus, “It is a figure of speech, teaching us that we must communicate with the passion of our Lord, and that we must treasure Him up kindly and usefully in the memory, because His flesh was crucified and wounded for us.”‡

in his treatise on the real presence of Christ, lays down as his rule for the interpretation of the fathers, that we must consider such expressions as “the body and blood of Christ”, or, “before consecration it is mere bread, but after consecration it is the body of Christ”; and so forth, to be used in no different sense from our Lord himself, “This is my body”; and so he says, “The Church of England expresses this mystery frequently in the same form of words, and we are so certain that to eat Christ’s body spiritually, is to eat him really; that there is no other way for him to be eaten really, than by spiritual manducation.”—See Jeremy Taylor, *Real Presence of Christ*, sect. xii. See also further observations in chap. v.

* Ambrose de sacr. lib. iv, c. 4.

† AUGUSTINE, bishop of Hippo, A.D. 395. At first a Manichæan, and a disbeliever in the scripture, but studying under Ambrose at Milan, was baptised in A.D. 387. He was the most eminent Latin father of the Church.

‡ August. de doctr. xi, John v, 1.

And again, "The Lord did not doubt to say, 'this is my body', when he gave the *sign* of His body."* And again, "If the sacraments had not any likeness to those things of which they are the sacraments, they would not at all be sacraments. From the likeness, they receive the name of the things themselves; as therefore, in a certain way, the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith." And again: "Understand what I have said *spiritually*; you are not about to eat this body which you see; I have commended a sacrament to you, which, being spiritually understood, will give you life."† And once more he compares the sacrifice of the Eucharist to those of the law—the one being in prospect, the other in retrospect—and both memorial, "Inasmuch as the flesh and blood of this sacrifice *before the coming* of Christ was promised by victims in similitude, and in *the passion* of Christ was offered in reality; so *after the advent* of Christ, it is celebrated by a sacrament of memory."

But we have no further need of testimony. Here is witness upon witness, confessor upon confessor, that, throughout this century, the doctrines

* August. Ep. ad Adim. c. 12.

† August. Ep. ad Bonifacium.

of the sacrament remained as our Lord intended. From so much being said, by so many authors, it unquestionably may be inferred, that in some places heretical notions had sprung up, and some of the superstitious tendencies, as detailed by Cyril of Jerusalem in the passage quoted from him, may have prevailed—but here, by this cloud of witnesses, we may thank God that sufficient care was taken in His Almighty councils to preserve the record of the primitive faith, and that the holy Eucharist, to the close of the fourth century, stands forth to the Christian world, pure and uncontaminate, in its leading articles of doctrine and of practice.

THE FIFTH CENTURY.

Towards the middle of this century, the northern nations commenced their invasion of Italy, and towards the close of it, the western empire was totally subdued, and the first barbarian king ascended the throne of the Cæsars. The barbarian nations, who thus took possession of the imperial city, had already been converted to the doctrines of the Gospel, and therefore religion did not suffer any external diminution from this event, either in its numerical extent or its authority; the Church, however, as regards its pastors and ministers, was sensibly declining from the simplicity of the Gospel

which Jesus preached ; “ The vices of the clergy”, says Mosheim, “ were now carried to the most enormous excess, and all the writers of this century, whose probity renders them worthy of credit, are unanimous in their accounts of the luxury, arrogance, and voluptuousness of the sacerdotal order ; but these opprobrious stains in their character would never have been endured, had not the greatest part of mankind been sunk in superstition and ignorance. Multitudes of people were in every country admitted, without examination or choice, into the body of the clergy, the greatest part of whom had no other view than the enjoyment of a lazy and inglorious repose.”* As to doctrine, the sacred and venerable simplicity of primitive times was fast departing ; superstition, the natural fruit of ignorance, grew apace, and difficulties, disputes, and schisms, mark the declining character of general Christianity. The images of those who during their lives had been celebrated for sanctity, were now honoured with a particular worship, and the bones of martyrs, and the figure of the cross, were looked upon as means of protection against danger, and as charms against the machinations of Satan. Another feature in the changing aspect of religion, is that of the institution of monastic orders. The monks who had

* Mosheim, vol. ii, pp. 26, 27, 28, 8vo edit.

formerly lived only for themselves, were now looked upon as a sacerdotal order, and took the first place, or at any rate a very eminent place, in the ranks of the clergy; and from this monastic system, although it was not without some fruits of blessing in the preservation of learning from the inroads of the barbarians, still it must be confessed there did arise many superstitious usages in the rites of our religion. The class or sect called Stylites or Pillar-men is of all the most extraordinary: these were persons who stood motionless upon the top of pillars, expressly raised for a trial of their patience, there remaining for years and years, amidst the admiration and applause of the stupid populace.*

Amid this general depravation of morality, the clergy declining in virtue, the people sinking in ignorance, no wonder that the sacrament of the Eucharist should begin to be clouded over in the universal darkness which prevailed. Rites and ceremonies were multiplied with every possible

* The most extraordinary of these fanatics was Simeon, who is described as dwelling upon a column raised to the height of sixty feet from the ground; there he existed, through summer and winter, for thirty years, making his devotions by various inflections of the body, sometimes with outstretched arms in the figure of a cross, sometimes bending down his head so as to reach the feet. And thus he thought to please God! See *Theod. Vita Patrum*, book ix.

Such practices and opinions may be justly brought forward to display the growing darkness which threatened the Christian world, and will diminish our surprise when we find other parts of Christian duty, such as the Eucharist, similarly perverted.

ingenuity, and the pomp and outward splendour of the Church increased in proportion to its inward corruption. The Agapæ, or love-feasts, which had so intimate a connexion with the Eucharist, were now discontinued, and the Eucharist itself was looked upon as a superstitious act between the priest and God, rather than an act of devotion, or a communication between Christ and His Church. Still, however, no outward or public act of the Church had changed its nature; no bull or edict of any bishop or council had spoken out upon the subject; it was merely the general tone of depravity, ignorance, and superstition, which as yet affected it: for this we have the testimony of the following writers:

First, Theodoret,* in his dialogue between Eranistes the Eutychian,† and Orthodoxus, on the divine mysteries, thus accidentally introduces the subject of the Eucharist.‡

“ *Orth.* The mystic symbols which are offered

* THEODORET, born at Antioch, appointed Bishop of Cyrus, a remote district of Syria, A.D. 423. He was principally celebrated in taking the part of Nestorius against Cyril. He died about the year 457.

† Eranistes in this dialogue is supposed to represent the opinions of heretics, and principally the followers of Eutyches, while Orthodoxus represents the Catholic faith of the Church. The heresy of Eutyches consisted in teaching that there was only one nature in Christ, that of the Incarnate Word. And in the dialogue above cited, Eranistes is contending that as in the sacrament the bread was changed into Christ's body, so in the Ascension the humanity was turned into the divinity.

‡ Theod. Dial. 2, t. 4, p. 85.

by the priest to God ; tell me, of what are they the symbols ?

“ *Er.* Of the body and blood of the Lord.

“ *Orth.* Of the body which is really so, or not really so ?

“ *Er.* Really so.”

And then afterwards :—

“ *Er.* It happens opportunely, that you are speaking of the divine mysteries ; for from this very thing I will shew you that the body of the Lord is changed into another nature. Answer, therefore, my questions. What do you call the gift which is brought before the invocation of the priest ?

“ *Orth.* That which is made a nutriment from seeds.

“ *Er.* How do you call the other sign ?

“ *Orth.* A sort of draught.

“ *Er.* After the consecration, how do you call them ?

“ *Orth.* The body of Christ and the blood of Christ.

“ *Er.* And do you believe that you are made partaker of the body and blood of Christ ?

“ *Orth.* I so believe.

“ *Er.* As therefore the symbols of the body and blood of our Lord are one thing before the consecration of the priest, but are changed after the

consecration, and are another thing, so the body of the Lord after his assumption is changed into a divine substance.

“*Orth.* You are caught in the net which you yourself have made. For the mystic signs do not recede from their nature after consecration, for they remain in their former substance, and figure, and form, and can be seen and touched as before; but they are understood to be those things which they have been made, and are thought so, and are worshipped as the things which they are thought.”

Now in this curious dialogue we are swayed backwards and forwards by the opposite assertions contained in it. It shews that a notion of some mysterious change, of worshipping the elements, and a communion something more than spiritual, prevailed; though at the same time, it appears to be the opinion of Theodoret himself, that there was only a spiritual and mystical addition to the elements, not a direct alteration.

But he speaks again for himself in another of his dialogues;—“Our Saviour would have those who are partakers of the divine mysteries not to mind the nature of the things they see, but by the change of names to believe that change. For He that called His own natural body wheat and bread, and gave it the name of a vine, He also ho-

noured the visible symptoms or elements with the name of His body and blood, *not changing their nature, but adding grace to nature.*”*

Another father in this century who gives his opinions on this subject is Gelasius.† In treating upon the two natures of Christ, he is led to speak of the nature of the sacraments as follows:—“Certainly the sacrament which we receive of the body and blood of Christ is a divine thing, because by them we are made partakers of the divine nature; and yet the substance and nature of bread and wine do not cease, but the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries. It is, therefore, shewn as sufficiently evident to us, that we must so think in regard to our Lord Christ, as we profess, celebrate, and receive, under His image, that as they (the bread and wine) pass into the divine substance, by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, and yet *their proper nature remains*, so is the great mystery whose efficacy and virtue they represent.”‡

Again, the error of communicating in one kind only, seems in this century to have been first agitated; for we find Gelasius elsewhere thus speaking: “Certain men, when they have received that

* Theod. Dial. tom. 4, p. 17.

† GELASIUS, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 495. A strenuous opposer of the Pelagians and Eutychians. The passage above cited is drawn forth as an argument in his writings against Eutyches.

‡ Gelas. de duabus in Christo naturis.—Bibl. Patr. v. 671.

part of the sacrament which is conveyed by the sacred body, abstain from the cup of the sacred blood, who, without doubt (since I know not by what superstition they are hindered), ought either to receive the whole sacrament, or to be kept away altogether: because there cannot be a division of one and the same mystery without great sacrilege.”* Likewise upon the necessity of every person in the church communicating, the Council of Toledo, which was very early in this fifth century, thus directs:—“Concerning those who enter the Church, and are found never to communicate, let them be admonished that if they do not communicate, they must submit to penance.”†

In regard to liturgies, we now find the Liturgy of S. Cyril of Alexandria‡ speaking in the same language as those quoted before, the same thanksgiving, the same oblation, and the same prayers; at least only so far varied as to give additional evidence, being separate in point of time and place, yet agreeing in doctrine and ceremonial observance. The prayer of oblation is thus,—“Before thy glory, O Holy Father, we place these sacred gifts, out of those things which are Thine own. Send down from above thy Holy Spirit upon us thy servants, and upon these venerable gifts placed before Thee,

* Gratia,—De Consecr. Dist. 2 Can. 12.

† Conc. Tolet. 1 Can. 13.

‡ S. CYRIL, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 212.

upon this bread and upon this cup.”* We also find full directions in this Liturgy as to many forms then in use,—the dismissal of the catechumens,—the salutation of peace, “Peace be with you,”—directions of the deacon to the people, where to “arise”, to “look towards the east”, to sing the hymn of “Tersanctus”, and the like; all which displays to us the care and the minuteness with which the holy Eucharist was still observed,—care and minuteness as far as public authority was concerned, although in peculiar instances erroneous notions might have begun to prevail. While then we can clearly shew from this century the continuance of the Eucharist as a Christian feast, at the same time we cannot but observe the doubts and false opinions of a great portion of the Christian world. The necessity of arguing *against* transubstantiation, as in the case of Theodoret, implies that there had already commenced a notion of the corporeal presence of Christ’s body in the sacrament. Nevertheless, the most eminent men in the Church, as we see by these quotations, remained as yet sound in the faith of this ordinance, even as Jesus Himself had delivered it.

THE SIXTH CENTURY.

The opening of the sixth century is not remark-

* Liturgia Cyrilli. Renaudot, Lit. Orient. Coll. tom. i, p. 47.

able for any great change in religious opinion. It is occupied principally by the reign of the emperor Justinian in the east, while the western empire is divided between the exarchate of Ravenna, and the kingdom of the Lombards. The seat of dominion is transferred from Rome to Constantinople. The Italians groan under the joint pressure of famine, pestilence, and the tyranny of barbarous strangers; while the bishop or pope of Rome is now silently acquiring more spiritual influence and greater temporal authority. The distress of the people compels them to lean upon any arm that may be extended for their help, and they are content to obviate present emergencies at the risk of future oppression. Thus it was, when after many years of painful and vexatious misrule, the papal chair being filled by Gregory the First, a politic and ambitious prelate, the citizens of Rome gladly threw themselves upon his protection, and established him in a much more extended temporal authority than any previous bishop had enjoyed. The words of a great historian, in relating this first approach to a temporal sovereignty, on the part of a Christian Bishop, are as follow. They breathe the usual sneer against the faith of the cross, but still they powerfully depict the nature of the struggle then first commencing of spiritual supremacy against the world. "Like Thebes, or

Babylon, or Carthage, the name of Rome might have been erased from the earth, if the city had not been animated by a vital principle which again restored her to honour and dominion. A vague tradition was embraced, that two Jewish teachers, a tent-maker and a fisherman, had formerly been executed in the circus of Nero, and at the end of five hundred years, their genuine or fictitious relics were adored as the palladium of Christian Rome. The pilgrims of the east and west resorted to the holy threshold, but the shrines of the apostles were guarded by miracles and invisible terrors; and it was not without fear that the pious catholic approached the object of his worship.”....“But the power as well as virtue of the apostles resided with living energy in the breast of their successors, and the chair of S. Peter was filled, under the reign of Maurice, by the first and greatest of the name of Gregory.”* The substance of which is, that when temporal dominion and temporal glory deserted the once-favoured city of Rome, the remembrance of those primitive ages, when the blood of Christian martyrs flowed through her streets, became a refreshing comfort to her mind. And the clergy, taking advantage of the depression under which the people laboured as to temporal things, directed them to look to spiritual things for consolation, and

* Gibbon, vol. viii, p. 161, 8vo edition.

scrupled not, for this purpose, to use any fraud or imposture that might offer itself, to gain the attention of the populace. From their minds being thus taught to admire, to reverence, and to submit to the superior sagacity of an ambitious clergy, they became an enslaved and bigoted people: they threw away the freedom with which Christ had endued them, and made those who wielded against them the juggling tricks of pretended miracles for the sake of Christ's glory, not only their leaders in spiritual things, but also in temporal. We must be minute in watching this turn of affairs, because it is evidently from this period that the corruptions of the Church of Rome, and, involved in that, the corruptions of the Eucharist, took their rise. With the great acquisition of power which the Church obtained under the pontificate of Gregory the First, or the Great, as he is generally termed, first began the usurpation and the sovereignty of Papal Rome; and strange to say, the spiritual bishop was soon to be lost in the more dazzling character of the temporal prince.

The bishops of Italy and the neighbouring islands joined in acknowledging the pope's supremacy. All translations and episcopal promotions were managed by his authority. The popular election of bishops was discontinued, or at least controlled by his interference: forty monks were despatched to our own country to propagate his opinions and

to baptize the Anglo-Saxons in the faith of the Roman Church ; and while these things occupied him in his clerical capacity, with no less adroitness did he act in politics, warding off, by constant mediation, the attacks of the Lombards, and while the enemy stood at the gates of the city of Rome, ready to conquer and destroy, the bishop, now armed with the affections of the people, ventured, upon his own ground, to negotiate peace and independence. Thus he seemed at once to establish himself by the splendour of his abilities, and the skill of his policy, without regard either to the exarchate of Ravenna, or the empire of the east, as the sole director both of the Church and of the state.

In the formation also and direction of the public liturgies, the same activity displayed itself. Hitherto the public worship of God had been observed by every nation in its own language.* The celebration of the Eucharist had been publicly

* The Church of Rome at the present day uses the Latin language as the language of her prayers, no matter what the language of the people may be ; but such was not always her custom. The fourth council of Lateran, A.D. 1415, canon ix, says, that, "because in most parts there are within the same state or diocese people of different languages, having under one faith various rites and customs ; we distinctly charge that the bishops provide proper persons to celebrate the divine offices and administer the sacraments *according to the difference of languages*, instructing them both by word and example." The council of Trent, however, A.D. 1562, decrees directly the reverse : "Although the mass contains much instruction for the faithful people, yet it did not seem good to the fathers that it should be everywhere celebrated in the common tongue."

They must reconcile this as they can.

observed with the plainness and simplicity with which its Divine Founder had appointed it. But simplicity did not suit the temper of the times. The people could not set value unless they saw mystery, and could not esteem a worship which was without ostentation. He accordingly presented to them an entirely new manner of administration, adorned it with many pompous forms, and sought to enliven the devotion which should attend it, by the power of novelty, and the charms of countless ceremonies. This new form of celebrating the Eucharist was called "*The canon of the mass.*"*

But notwithstanding the great influence of Gregory, it was not till some years had elapsed that it was adopted by all the Latin Churches, and though it was the forerunner of dangerous abuses, even yet, in itself it affected not the essence or the original substance of the institution,—overloading it with cumbrous display, rather than changing or destroying its foundations. This may be accounted for by understanding that the *Missals* of the Church of Rome were different from that which should more strictly be called her *Liturgy*. The Roman Liturgy

* The reason of the name *mass* may not perhaps be understood. The Latin word is *missa*, and signifies no more than dismissal. The catechumens and that portion of the Church which did not communicate, penitents, and others, were dismissed by the deacon upon his saying the words, "*Ite, missa est*", and so it came to pass that the remaining part of the service, or communion, received the name of "*missa*", and in the English, *mass*.

cannot be traced so far back as those of the Eastern Churches already mentioned; but still, there is every reason to think that there had been a Liturgy from the earliest times, agreeing in the main with the other Churches. This *Liturgy* always remained the same. There was no variation in it, but it always formed the foundation of the Eucharistic Service; whereas the *Missæ* were novel introductions, brought in by different popes, to suit the various saints' days, and other days of observance, which their Church delighted in. It was probably then in these *Missæ* that Gregory made his great additions to the Eucharistic service; and this will account for our saying, that the foundations might remain secure, while many pomps and ceremonies might be added from time to time. In the Liturgy of Gregory, we find the order of celebration as follows: first, a hymn or anthem, then a sermon, after which the catechumens were dismissed, and then the oblations of the people were laid upon the altar; then the hymn "Ter Sanctus", and Prayer of Oblation, in very nearly the same language as in the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom previously quoted. In the Oblation, it was asked that the "Holy Ghost might descend, and make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ"; but in this, we see no more than we have already seen in the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom. After this, the bread was

broken, and distributed among the communicants. There was no idea of transubstantiation,—no elevation of the Host for worship. The only change seems to be the introduction of a greater degree of pomp and magnificence in the ritual to be observed.

The general state of doctrine, we may gather from the following writers: Fulgentius:* “But in that sacrifice there is a giving of thanks, and a *commemoration* of the flesh of Christ, which He gave for us, and His blood which He shed for us.”† And again, commenting on the words, “This cup is the new testament of my blood”, he says, “That is, this cup which I give you, *represents* the new testament.” Facundus‡—“Now the sacrament of adoption may be called adoption; as we call the sacrament of His body and blood, which is in the consecrated cup, His body and blood; not because the bread is properly His body, nor the cup His blood; but because they contain the *mystery* of His body and blood: whence our Saviour, when He blessed the bread and cup, and gave them to His disciples, *called* them His body and blood”: on which Bingham remarks, “It is plain, according to Fa-

* FULGENTIUS, Bp. of Ruspa, born A.D. 468, and appointed bishop A.D. 504; was principally engaged against the Arians.

† Ad Petrum, c. xix.

‡ FACUNDUS, Bishop of Hermiana, in Africa, A.D. 540. His principal work was “The Defence of the Three Chapters”, from which the above quotation is taken.

cundus, that the bread and wine are not properly the body and blood of Christ, but properly bread and wine still, and only *called* His body and blood : as baptism and circumcision are called adoption, because they are the sacraments of adoption, and not the very thing which they represent.”* Again, Ephrem,† bishop of Antioch, who wrote against the Eutychians: “No man that hath any reason will say, that the nature of palpable and impalpable, visible and invisible, is the same ; for so the body of Christ, which is received by the faithful, does not depart from its own sensible substance, and yet it is united to a spiritual grace.”‡

So Dionysius,§ the Areopagite, says, “These things (the sacred elements placed upon the altar) are *symbols*, and not the truth or reality.” So Hesychius,|| speaking of the same mystery : “It is both *bread* and flesh too.” And so Procopius,¶ of

* Book xv, c. v, s. iv.

† EPHREM. After obtaining considerable secular eminence, Ephrem dedicated himself to the service of the Church. During an earthquake which destroyed the city of Antioch, and in which the bishop, Euphrasius, had perished, Ephrem became so popular from his charitable exertions, that he was chosen his successor, A.D. 526.

‡ Ephrem ad Photium, cod. 229.

§ DIONYSIUS. It is thought that the name of *the Areopagite*, does not rightly belong to this Dionysius, but whether or no, does not much matter, as the quotation above made belongs to some author of the sixth century, and is equally applicable to our present purpose.

|| HESYCHIUS, Bishop of Jerusalem, supposed to have died about the year A.D. 529.

¶ PROCOPIUS, born at Gaza, a Sophist, A.D. 529.

Gaza: "He gave to his disciples the *image* of His own body."

To these authors, thus incidentally conveying the opinions of the Church, we must add the council of Agde, which issued a decree, specifying certain times at which it was necessary to communicate: "The laity, who do not communicate on the day of our Lord's nativity, Easter, and Whitsuntide, cannot be called Catholics, nor can be reckoned among Catholics." This was indeed a great deviation from the original custom of *weekly* communion, and it displays a great declension of religious feeling on the part of the people, that such an edict was necessary; but we must be thankful that even thus much was retained—we must be thankful that in spite of the increased ceremonial observances which Gregory introduced, still the sacrament of the Eucharist in *any way* continued its hold upon the Church; and when we have examined the authors above quoted, and at the same time take into consideration the lamentable state of ignorance and superstition into which the world was plunged, that it was in too many instances the "blind leading the blind", that the public ministers and teachers of religion were for the most part as ignorant as the people whom they were appointed to teach; that the worship of images and of saints, the fire of purgatory, the

power of relics to heal the diseases of the body and of the mind,—that these and similar erroneous tenets now began to prevail—the only wonder is that the Eucharist continued as it did; that no further inroads than that of calling it “*the mass*”, and adorning it with worldly ceremonies, had yet been made upon its apostolical simplicity.

But in names and in externals, the seeds are very often sown of internal error: and so in this case we shall not have long to wait, before the fruits of these superstitions will display themselves to the dishonour of God, and to the subversion, at least temporary subversion, of this Holy Sacrament.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY : FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE SEVENTH
TO THE CLOSE OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

1 COR. XI, 26.

For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew
the Lord's death *till He come*.

THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

IT is not easy to say at what precise epoch any abuse or corruption in the Church took its actual rise, nor is it easy to mark, in any declension from primitive usage, the exact *cause* to which it should be assigned. The stages of declension, as well as those of growth, are slow and imperceptible ; and while we readily perceive a discrepancy between two points when they are at intervals of time widely separated, we look for it in vain when our comparison is made between times closely approximating. So in the history of the holy *Eucharist*, if we take the period of time just antecedent to the Reformation, and compare it at a glance with any period prior to the close of the sixth century, the difference of the two pictures, both in spirit

and in fact, will immediately arrest us; but if we pass quietly on from the sixth century to the seventh, and so from century to century, the difference will not be striking, though certain it is that at *some* period between the sixth and the fifteenth, a gigantic evil had imperceptibly grown and spread over the whole of Christendom.

Gregory the Great still governed Rome at the commencement of the seventh century, and his power and influence were still increasing: a rival, however, in a distant region, was now about to spring up; a rival whose extraordinary genius, and more extraordinary religion, was soon to expel Christianity from her birth-place, and to dispute her dominion not only in the east, but in every nation of the civilized world. To understand the origin of this new religion, we must remember that the Church of Christ, during the progress of six centuries, had contracted many corruptions, and among the worst of these corruptions was the worship of images. How this practice gradually arose it is difficult to ascertain, but it seems to have received its origin, strange as it may appear, at the precise moment when paganism was subverted, and Christianity became the dominant religion of the state. The natural passions of mankind, the infirm reason of the uneducated, and the prejudices of custom, seemed to demand in the converted

heathen, something more tangible, something more visible to the senses, than the spiritual and immaterial God of the Christians; and consequently, when idols were prohibited, and the worship of polytheism was discarded by law, mankind would still delight in the possession of some token or memorial of the religion which they were taught to believe. Hence their delight in relics, in the bones of martyrs, in the representation, either by painting or statue, of the apostles and primitive teachers of Christianity: and as God had Himself descended upon earth in human form, and had been born of a human mother, nothing would delight the pious and devout Christian so much, as the possession of some memento of the Saviour and His Virgin Mother. The transition from love of the relic, to adoration, would be easy in an ignorant mind; and thus it might happen, that, before the images of saints, or the pictures of martyrs, the unlearned Christian would, either as to mediators or Gods, bow the body, or address his prayers. While, then, this depraved and sensual notion of Christianity was daily making ground, Mahomet, or more properly Mohammed, began to preach in Arabia the unity of God, and himself God's prophet. First, by an insidious policy, and then by the force of arms, he compelled his countrymen to believe in his pretended mission. The idolatry of Arabia

disgusted and displeased him: he then turned to the Christians, and there beheld an equal idolatry, the worship of images, and an apparent return to polytheism, in a notion of a Trinity in the Godhead. He might have been at first an enthusiast, but at any rate he made his enthusiasm subservient to his policy; or he might have been a deep and subtle politician, while he disguised his policy in the dress of religious enthusiasm; but be that as it may, the errors of the Christians in their image worship, and their absurd dissensions on the subject of the Trinity, first opened the road to his advances, and made intelligible his watchword, "There is *one* God, and Mahomet is his prophet." And thus, while he taught the world to disbelieve one error, he made haste to propagate a greater; and following it up with vigour, with subtilty, and with the force of arms, his religion, during the course of twelve centuries, embraced and still continues to embrace, to a great extent, the Indian, the African, and the Turk.

But how does our immediate object become affected by this? Nothing, perhaps, ever affected the doctrine of the holy Eucharist, so much as the practice of image worship. Nothing, perhaps, laid the foundation of the Romish notion of transubstantiation in a greater degree, than the carving of images, and the searching for relics as objects of

love and worship. The canon of the mass was now celebrated with greater splendour, in proportion as the doctrines of the Church were more sensual. The elements of the Eucharistic feast were held forth to the public view as objects of admiration, because the public had been taught to value religion by the external aids of crucifixes, statues, and pictures. The priests were adorned in their vestments with more costly decoration; because, again, the people had been taught to gaze at, and admire, before they loved; and, like the savage, were caught by glitter and display, rather than instruction and elevation by inward holiness and faith. The following anecdote from the life of Gregory the Great, will display an approach to transubstantiation curiously answered: "A woman to whom he was about to give the Eucharist in the usual form of words, 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul', laughed at the form, and being asked the reason for her so doing, said, it was because he called *that* the body of Christ, which she knew to be bread, as she had made it with her own hands."* But the expression in this case, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ", need not have rendered that answer necessary. It might merely have been used in the same spiritual sense in which we at the present day administer the

* Greg. Vita, lib. ii. c. 41.

sacred symbols: but be that as it may, it displays a general popular notion of some mysterious change. It shews that the *thought* of transubstantiation was already rife among the people, though not yet embodied in *words*.

Gregory himself could not have used it in any sense of transubstantiation, because we know from several passages in his writings, that his opinions were on the contrary side. However he might have destroyed the primitive simplicity of the Eucharist by his costly and pompous ceremonies, he yet, as to doctrine, maintained the orthodox faith. In one place he says:—"Although the body should be consecrated in many places, and innumerable days, yet there are not many bodies of Christ, nor many cups, but one body of Christ, and one cup," etc.: whereas the doctrine of transubstantiation would make each sacrifice, and each communion, a new body.

In addition to Gregory,* we have two eminent writers of the seventh century, who have expressed opinions on this point, but unfortunately they are directly opposed to each other. The one is Isidore, the other Eligius. The former of these, Isidore,† is

* The life of Gregory extended to the year A.D. 604, we may therefore include any testimony from his writings as belonging to the commencement of the seventh century.

† ISIDORE was born at Seville in Spain, and was afterwards bishop of that see; in A.D. 633, he presided at the fourth national council of Toledo. He died A.D. 636.

of the same opinion as Gregory, and writes as follows:—"The sacrifice of the Lord's Supper is received by the whole Church fasting,* for so it pleased the Holy Spirit, through the apostles, that in honour of so great a sacrament, the body of our Lord should enter the mouth of the Christian before other food. For the bread which we break is the body of Christ, who said, 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven'; and the wine is His blood, as it is written, 'I am the true vine'; but the bread, because it strengthens the body, is therefore *called* the body; and the wine, because it makes blood in the flesh, is therefore *referred* to the blood of Christ. But these, while they are visible, yet being sanctified by the Holy Spirit, pass into the sacrament of the divine body."† Again, in another place, he says, "As the visible substances of bread and wine nourish the outward man, so the word of Christ, who is the bread of life, refresheth the souls of the faithful, being received by faith."‡ Again, in the same writer,

* It seems to have been the custom of the Church in primitive times to celebrate the Eucharist fasting, excepting on one day, which was the Thursday in Passion week. Bingham cites a great many authorities to shew this custom, but at the same time does not think that it was invariable. The council of Carthage decrees that "the sacrament of the altar should not be received by any but the fasting, except on one annual day, called 'cœna Domini'."—See Bingham, book xv, c. vii, s. 8, and Hospinian, Hist. Sacr. vol. i, p. 25.

† Isid. de Eccl. Off. lib. i, c. 18. ‡ Isid. Orig. lib. vi, c. 19.

we find the assertion, that there are only two sacraments, “one baptism, the other the body and blood of Christ, which are called sacraments, for this reason, because, under the appearance of corporeal things, the divine virtue secretly works the force of a sacrament, whence, from their secret or *sacred* virtues, they are called sacraments.”*

While, however, these passages testify clearly to the orthodox faith, we have an extremely remarkable assertion in Eligius,† in the year 650, of precisely a contrary tendency, one which boldly and openly asserts the doctrine of transubstantiation. “Know truly, and believe firmly, that as the flesh of Christ which He assumed in the womb of the Virgin is His true body, and was slain for our salvation, so the bread which He gave to His disciples, and which His priests daily consecrate in the Church, is the true body of Christ. And there are not two bodies, the flesh which He assumed and the bread, but only one body, in so much as it is broken and eaten.”‡

We should be glad indeed to adopt the rule given by Bishop Taylor, and to make full allowance for the figurative language of the times, but the pecu-

* Isid. Orig. lib. vi, c. 19.

† ELIGIUS, born near the city of Limoges, in France; he for some time practised the trade of a goldsmith, but was afterwards Bishop of Noyon. Died A.D. 659.

‡ Eligius, Hom. xv.

liar force of the above expressions cannot easily be overcome. "*As the flesh of Christ is His body, so the bread.*" It seems at once to reject all interference of explanation by any spiritual meaning. The popular superstition was already making its way to the guides and rulers of the people.

THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

We have already seen the rise of image worship in the Church of Rome, and the consequent rise of the Mohammedan religion in Arabia. We now have to trace another consequence of this absurd perversion of Christianity, no less than that of a totally new empire in the west, and the entire separation of the Roman pontiff from all intercourse with the Eastern Church. Leo, the Isaurian, emperor of the east, conceiving that the worship of senseless stocks and stones was more suitable to Pagans than to Christians, exerted himself most vigorously to destroy it. He at once prohibited the setting up of any images or pictures in the churches, and ordered the destruction of those which had already been made objects of adoration. The immediate consequence was a civil war in all the Italian provinces. Pepin was now king of the Franks, Stephen the pope of Rome. The pope, fearful on the one hand that he should suffer from his adherence to image worship at the hands of

Leo, and being at the same time pressed by the Lombards, who harassed his dominions in another quarter, made application to Pepin for assistance. Pepin, who was an usurper, and had dethroned his lawful sovereign Childeric, was glad at any price to obtain the countenance of the Church. He therefore sent the required assistance to the pope, twice defeated the king of the Lombards, and established the Roman pontiff in all the dominions of the exarchate of Ravenna. This grant of territory and dominion was further augmented and confirmed by Charlemagne, the son of Pepin; and the pope, in return for these substantial gifts, was glad to confer the sanction of the Church on the establishment of the great western empire under Charlemagne.

Such is as brief an account as can well be given of this great historical event. Charlemagne retaining under his empire the general supreme power, while he granted to the Church of Rome a subordinate and separate jurisdiction over her especial and appointed territories; while Leo, surnamed the Iconoclast, or image-breaker, set at defiance by the increased strength thus acquired, was compelled to give way; and though in the east he succeeded in his wise and Christian endeavours to restore a purer worship, yet by so doing he brought about the great schism between the eastern and

western Churches, which led very shortly after to their final and complete separation.

Thus, then, with regard to religion, we might naturally expect with this increase of power an increase of those abuses which had already commenced. Mosheim* describes the effect which all this had upon the administration of the Eucharist as follows:—"The administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which was deemed the most solemn and important branch of divine worship, was now everywhere embellished, or rather deformed with a variety of senseless fopperies, which destroyed the beautiful simplicity of that affecting and salutary institution." In addition to this, we find evident traces of the commencement of *solitary* masses. Solitary masses are those which are celebrated by the priest alone, in behalf of souls detained in purgatory.† The cause of this inno-

* Mosheim, vol. ii, p. 242.

† The reader will bear in mind that a mass is a sacrifice, and therefore that in the notion of a solitary mass, we must understand that the priest, without any reference to a communion, is supposed to offer the sacrifice of the Son of God, and he is supposed to offer that sacrifice in behalf of the souls of the dead. This error could never have arisen without the existence of the previous error—that of purgatory. Gregory the Great, in the previous century, was most expressly a believer in purgatory. "We must believe that there is a purgatorial fire for certain light faults."—Dialog. lib. iv, c. 39. Again: "After the death of the flesh, some are immersed in eternal punishments, others pass to life through the fire of purgation"; and the notion was, that the prayers of the faithful, and the masses of the priests, could expedite the deliverance of the soul from this purgatorial state. That this is still the doctrine of the Roman Church, see the decree of the Council of Trent, session xxv, A.D. 1563.

vation is easily discerned. The Church was now become a Church of the world. Temporal power and temporal riches were her delight. The wealthy and noble would gladly leave their wealth to men who had the power, by their prayers and their sacrifices, to obtain for them pardon for their sins and salvation for their souls. Hence, therefore, the doctrine of purgatory being once established, the masses for the dead would be encouraged by the clergy, while the wealth of the laity would be willingly received in return by those whose temporal glory was the highest point of their ambition. But how glaring, how strange a perversion! The sacrament of the Eucharist, or thanksgiving, in which *all* are to *communicate*, performed by one man, and that without any reference to the living, or the commemoration of Christ, but as a sacrifice for the souls of the absent and the dead. "This single custom", says Mosheim, "is sufficient to give us an idea of the superstition and darkness which sat brooding over the Christian Church in this ignorant age, and renders it unnecessary to enter into a further detail of the absurd rites with which a designing priesthood continued to disfigure the religion of Jesus."*

Three of the principal authors who flourished in

* Mosheim, vol. ii, p. 244.

this century are Bede,* John Damascenus,† and Alcuinus.‡ While they speak of the many errors above alluded to, such as purgatory, relics, solitary masses, and the like, with no uncertain voice, yet they abound in passages concerning transubstantiation, which each party might quote with equal triumph. Alcuinus says, “ Everything that is offered in this oblation is a mystery, which ought to be received with purity of faith, but cannot be comprehended by the subtilty of reason; for one thing is seen, another understood. That which is seen has a bodily appearance; that which is understood has a spiritual fruit. Christ fills the altar, and proposes Himself as food. He is slain, not killed; He is eaten, not diminished: He refreshes us, but does not decrease; though eaten, He lives, because He is risen from the dead. O wonderful and ineffable! O mystery of faith! All eat of Him, yet each eats the whole; He is divided into parts, but the whole is in the parts; He is eaten

* BEDE, born in England, A.D. 672. Was looked upon as the wonder and ornament of his age. In science, religion, grammar, and mathematics, considering the general darkness and ignorance of the times, his writings are certainly wonderful. He died A.D. 735.

† JOHN DAMASCENUS, called Chrysorrhoeas, because of his eloquence. Native of Damascus; was a great advocate for image worship, and incurred the hostility of Leo the Isaurian. Died in A.D. 750.

‡ ALCUINUS, pupil of the venerable Bede, and deacon of the church of York: afterwards the head of the monastery of Tours. Died A.D. 804. A great patron and supporter of learning.

by the people, yet He remains entire ; He is wholly in heaven, yet He is wholly in the hearts of the faithful. He purges sins, His death makes alive ; He strengthens the weak, He preserves the sound.”* Now this may be understood spiritually, and may be claimed by one side as *not favouring* transubstantiation ; while, in another place it might be said, he speaks as strongly as any of the Roman Church could desire *in favour* of transubstantiation ; for he says : “ I the least of the faithful, do not at all doubt, but for my whole part believe, that the sacrament of divine and life-giving virtue is the true flesh of Christ, on which we feed, and His true blood of which we drink.”

Damascenus writes as follows : “ As the water of Baptism is the laver of regeneration, so also the bread and wine, by the junction of divine grace, become the body and blood of Christ. As in baptism, because it is the custom and habit of men to be washed with water, and anointed with oil, He has joined the grace of the Holy Ghost to the oil and water : in the same way, because it is the custom of men to eat bread and drink wine mixed with water, He has joined the divine grace to these, and has made them the body and blood, that we may enjoy those things which are *beyond* nature, by customary means, and things which are *accord-*

* Alcuin. Conf. Fid. fol. edition, p. 413.

ing to nature.”* In this, there appears nothing beyond the usual notion of a spiritual change. But yet he seems to speak, in another place, as decidedly on the contrary side: “The bread and wine are not the figure of the body and blood of Christ, but His *very body deified*, because He himself said, ‘This is my body’; not the *figure* of my body, but ‘my body’.”† How can we imagine two such passages as these to proceed from the same pen?

The third author who was mentioned is Bede. Commenting on S. Mark, he says, that “Christ gave the *mysteries* of His flesh and blood to be celebrated.”‡ Again, “Christ did not exclude Judas from the holy supper, in which He delivered to His disciples the *figure* of His holy body and blood.”§ Again, on the words of S. John, “Behold the Lamb of God”—“He daily taketh away the sins of the world, and washes us from our sins, when the remembrance of His passion is again made a sacrifice on the altar, when the creatures of bread and wine are transferred by the ineffable sanctification of the Spirit, into the flesh and blood of Christ, and so His body and blood is slain and poured out, not by the hands of the faithless to their own destruction, but received by the mouth of the faithful to their salvation.”|| Lastly, in

* Damasc. de Orthod. Fid. lib. iv, c. 14. † Ibid.

‡ Bede in Marc. lib. iii, c. 6. § Bede in Ps. iii.

|| Hospinian remarks on this passage, “From these words of

Paul, the deacon,* who wrote the life of Gregory the Great, we find the following assertion, than which nothing can be more decided: "The Creator foreknowing our infirmity, by that power by which He made all things of nothing, and made a body from the flesh of the virgin; He by the operation of the Holy Ghost turns bread and wine, mixed with water, into His flesh and blood, *their own proper kind still remaining.*"

This then will be sufficient testimony for the opinions of the eighth century.

THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES.

Hitherto the sacrament of the Eucharist, in spite of the many additions and changes which, as we have seen, had been made from time to time in its form and celebration, as far as the doctrines of the Church were concerned, maintained its essential features. We have already seen the opinion of some few authors as decidedly tending to transubstantiation, and we have every reason to think that this opinion was general, though not expressed

Bede, we understand that the *remembrance* of the passion of our Lord, is the sacrifice which is offered on the altar, for he says that it is offered in the *creatures* of bread and wine; therefore in this sacrifice the substances of bread and wine remain, but they are mystically called the body and blood, and received in sacred communion by the faithful."—Hospin. Hist. Sacra, lib. iii, c. 7.

* PAUL THE DEACON.—He was deacon of Aquileia, historian and poet, A.D. 774.

openly by the Church.* But image worship, purgatory, and masses for the dead, were now open and professed doctrines of the Church, and it therefore wanted but little more to assert the corporeal presence of Christ in the elements of the sacrament. Accordingly, in the ninth century, first began to be canvassed the peculiar doctrine that the bread and wine used by the authority of Christ in the commemorative sacrifice of His body and blood, were after consecration no longer bread and wine, but by the word of prayer and invocation of the Holy Ghost were commuted and transformed into the actual and material body and blood of our Saviour. If we consider a moment the state to which the human mind had been reduced, the darkness and ignorance in which the world had, by successive inroads of a designing priesthood, been immersed, we shall not be so much surprised even at this. It was an easy transition from imagining a block of stone or a mass of gold to be God, to imagining a lump of bread, and a cupful of wine, a human body, and human blood. If one were true, why not the other? if one were to be worshipped,

* In fact, the sentiments of Christians concerning the nature and manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, had been various and contradictory, but no Council had determined either one way or the other. Both reason and folly had been left free; nor had any imperious mode of faith suspended the exercise of the one, or restrained the extravagance of the other.—See Mosheim, vol. ii, p. 306.

why not the other? Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and afterwards abbot of Corbey, pretended to explain with precision, and determine with certainty, the doctrine of the Church; and for this purpose he composed a treatise on the subject, which he published in the year 831. "His doctrines amounted to the two following propositions: First, that after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the outward figure, under which the body and blood of Christ were really and locally present; and secondly, that the body of Christ, thus present in the Eucharist, was the same body that was born of the virgin, that suffered upon the cross, and was raised from the dead."* Consonant, however, as this doctrine was with the ignorance of the times, it was not received without opposition. Charles the Bald, emperor of the Franks, ordered two of the most able men of the day, Ratram, or Bertram,† and Johannes Scotus,‡ to draw up a

* Mosheim, vol. ii, p. 306.

† RATRAM, or BERTRAM, a monk of Corbey, A.D. 840; the same monastery of which Radbert was the head. Charles the Bald proposed two questions to him; 1st, "Whether the body of Christ was in the Eucharist?" 2dly, "Whether the body which was born, crucified, and ascended to heaven, was the same which was received by the faithful in the Eucharist?" Upon these two questions Bertram's tract was written.

‡ JOHANNES SCOTUS, a Scotchman, as his name implies, was a great favourite with Charles the Bald, after whose death he returned to England, and was placed at the head of the university of Oxford by Alfred the Great. Died A.D. 886.

clear and rational account of the Eucharist. They did so, and they decidedly pointed out the error into which Radbert had fallen ; both maintained that the bread and wine did not lose the substance of bread and wine, but were only sacramentally changed, and that the body of Christ was not present in the Eucharist, except so far as understood spiritually and sacramentally. The writings of Scotus have perished in the ruins of time, but those of Bertram still remain. Having first quoted a passage from S. Augustine's epistle to Boniface, he thus proceeds : " Since there is one body of the Lord, in which He suffered once, and one blood, which was shed for the salvation of the world—the sacraments have taken the names of those things, so that they are called the body and blood of Christ, on account of their *similitude*". And again : " Let your wisdom consider, most illustrious prince, that even if the sacred scriptures are set aside, it is clearly proved by the words of the fathers that there is no small difference between the body which exists by mystery, and the body which suffered ; because the one is the proper body of the Saviour, nor in it is any figure ; but in the other, which exists in the mystery, there is the figure, not only of the proper body of Christ, but also of the people who believe in Him". And in another place he says, " We are taught by the

Saviour, and also the apostle Paul, that that bread and that blood which are put upon the altar, are put there in the figure and memory of our Lord's death; that what is done in the past, he may recall to memory by the present, so that being mindful of His passion, we are made through that partakers of His divine promise, by which we are freed from death: knowing that when we shall come into the presence of Christ, we shall not need such *instruments* by which to be admonished of the things which His great kindness has done.”*

Nor did Bertram stand alone. Amalarius,† who lived very early in the ninth century, writes thus: “Sacraments ought to have the similitude of the things of which they are the sacraments; wherefore the priest is like Christ, as the bread and wine are like the body of Christ”.‡ Again, the same writer says: “It is manifest that the mass is celebrated principally in remembrance of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whose memory it is done.” So also Rabanus Maurus: “As the material food externally nourishes the body, so the word of God in it nourishes and confirms the soul. The sacrament is one thing, the *virtue* of the sacrament another. The sacrament is received in

* Bertram, On the body and blood of the Lord.

† AMALARIUS, Bishop of Mentz, A.D. 812.

‡ De Eccles. Off. Præf.

the mouth, but the inner man is satiated by the *virtue* of the sacrament; for the sacrament is reduced to the nourishment of the body; but by the *virtue* of the sacrament, the dignity of eternal life is maintained.”*

While, however, we range Amalarius and Rabanus Maurus on the side of Bertram, we must place another author of this century as decidedly against him. Haymo,† bishop of Halberstadt, writes thus: “So we believe and faithfully confess, and hold that that substance, namely, bread and wine, is substantially changed into another substance, by the operation of a divine virtue, that is, the nature of bread and wine into flesh and blood”. And again: “The invisible Priest changes His visible creatures into the substance of His own flesh and blood by a secret power. In which body and blood of Christ, on account of the dread of those who receive it, the taste and form of bread and wine remain, but the nature and substance is altogether changed into the body and blood of Christ.”‡ From these passages we clearly see the progress which the doctrine of transubstantiation had already made,—decidedly maintained by one

* RABANUS MAURUS, head of the monastery of Fulda, A.D. 847, and afterwards Archbishop of Mayence.

† HAYMO, pupil, together with Rabanus Maurus, of Alcuin, Abbot of Hersfield, and afterwards Bishop of Halberstadt, A.D. 853.

‡ Haymo, On the body and blood of Christ.

party, but still as decidedly opposed by another party:—and thus the matter remained for the ninth and tenth centuries—the doctrine being openly canvassed, but no decision made. Radbert on one side, and Bertram on the other, being the avowed and selected champions of each party, may fairly represent the opinions of the day.

From this to the middle of the eleventh century, we hear little more of the controversy, the Christian world being occupied in the Crusades, and in the great schism between the Greek and Latin Churches; the power of the Roman Church increasing and the ignorance of the dark ages having now fairly set in; all authority in matters of faith being left to the arbitrary decision of the pope; and whether with or without evidence, for or against reason, the dictum of the priests, the faith of the people.

THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURIES.

The question of Christ's real presence in the bread and wine of the Eucharist again occupies the serious attention of the Church: the dispute of Radbert and Bertram is revived, and in the beginning of the century, Berenger,* archdeacon of Angers, a man highly renowned, both on account of his extensive learning and the sanctity of his

* BERENGER, born at Tours, in France, Archdeacon of Angers, A.D. 1035; principally opposed to Lanfranc: died A.D. 1088.

life, stood forth against the prevailing opinion, and stoutly maintained the absurdity and impiety of Radbert's doctrine.* He took the side of Johannes Scotus and Bertram, and persevered with noble resolution in teaching that the bread and wine of the Eucharist were not changed into the body and blood of our Saviour, but preserved their natural and essential qualities, and were no more than figures or external symbols of the body and blood of Christ. Thus he took a solitary position, and a dangerous one, as it soon turned out. Leo the Ninth, then pope, attacked this daring opposition to the popular doctrine with peculiar vehemence; and in two councils, one at Rome, the other at Vercelli, condemned publicly the doctrine broached by Berenger, and committed to the flames the writings of Scotus, from which the doctrines emanated. Berenger himself was deposed from his office, deprived of all his revenues, and threatened with every evil, temporal and spiritual. For a considerable time, nothing could shake him; he remained firm in his opinions during the pontificate of Leo. But no sooner was this prelate succeeded by Gregory VII, than new persecutions awaited him; and at last he was so overpowered by the threats of his enemies, that though his reason was unconvinced, he yet publicly abjured his former

* Mosheim, vol. ii, p. 505.

opinions : a confession was drawn up recanting his errors, and declaring, “ that the bread and wine, after consecration, were not only a sacrament, but also the real body and blood of Jesus Christ ; and that this body and blood were handled by the priests, and consumed by the faithful, not merely in a sacramental sense, but in reality and truth, as other sensible objects are.” To this declaration he attached his signature ; and being the result of a deliberate council, assembled especially to discuss the point, we may take it as the first open decree of the Church in favour of transubstantiation. Nothing can be expressed more clearly, or more free from all ambiguous terms—“ *The body handled and eaten, not sacramentally, but as other sensible objects are.*” But this was not enough. Two other declarations were imposed upon him ; and at two other separate councils he was compelled again to make declaration of his faith. In the first, “ That the bread deposited upon the altar, became, after consecration, the true body of Christ, which was born of the virgin, suffered on the cross, and now sits at the right hand of the Father ; and that the wine placed upon the altar, became, after consecration, the true blood which flowed from the side of Christ”.* Again, a third time : “ That the bread and wine, by the mysterious influence of the holy

* Mosheim, vol. ii, p. 508.

prayer, and the words of our Redeemer, were substantially changed into the true, proper, and vivifying body and blood of Jesus Christ." It is, however, but fair to say, that Berenger again retracted this before his death, and relapsed into his former opinions.

Whatever we may think of the vacillation of Berenger, these expressions, drawn up publicly by separate councils, and forced upon an individual as a confession of faith, plainly shew the decided terms in which the Church now stated her doctrine of transubstantiation. The year of these confessions is about 1079; and advancing from this, into the twelfth century, we find error upon error increasing: no sooner is one confirmed than another starts up—no sooner is the corporeal presence of Christ openly avowed by the councils of the Church, than they commence the agitation of an entirely new question,—the administration of the cup to the laity. Hitherto the Eucharist had been received in both kinds by all who approached the steps of the altar: of this, there is abundant testimony in the ancient writings; and even cardinal Bona, who was strictly devoted to the Roman tenets, confesses that such was the doctrine of the primitive Church. "It is very certain", he says, "that anciently, all, both clergy and laity, men and women, received the holy mysteries in both kinds when they were

present at the solemn celebration of them. But out of the time of sacrifice, and out of the church, it was customary always, and in all places, to communicate only in one kind. In the first part of the assertion all agree, both Catholics and sectaries; *nor can any one deny it, that has the least knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs.* For the faithful, always, and in all places, from the very first foundation of the Church, till the twelfth century, were accustomed to communicate under the species of bread and wine; and in the beginning of that age, the use of the cup began, by little and little, to be laid aside, whilst many bishops interdicted the people the use of the cup, for fear of irreverence and effusion.”* The fact is, then, that the former error of transubstantiation is the source of the latter,—denying the cup. As the opinion increased, that the elements in the Eucharist became by consecration the real body and blood of Christ, it was natural that they should be considered with increased respect, and even adoration, by those who partook of them. In drinking the wine from the cup, it might happen that some would be spilled, or otherwise wasted, in handing it from person to person; looking upon it as a matter of great profanation, that the actual blood of Christ should be so misused by the negligence of men, the clergy

* Bona, *Rer. Liturg. lib. ii, c. 18.*

would naturally devise means of avoiding it; this they did at first, by sucking the wine from the cup by means of quills, or straws, and afterwards by mingling the two elements together, sopping the bread in the wine, and thus communicating in both kinds at once. “In England the custom of mingling the elements so far prevailed, that Arnulphus, bishop of Rochester, in the year 1120, wrote a letter in defence of it; where one Lambert proposes the question to him, why the Eucharist was administered at present after a different and almost contrary manner to that which was observed by Jesus Christ, because it was customary at that time to distribute an host steeped in wine to the communicants, whereas, Jesus Christ gave His body and blood separately? To this, Arnulphus answers, that this was one of those things which might be altered, and therefore, though anciently the two species of bread and wine were given separately, yet now they were given together, lest any ill accidents should happen in the distribution of the wine alone, and lest they should stick on the hairs of the beard, or the whiskers, or be spilt by the minister.”* On the other hand, Hambertus, who wrote in the eleventh century, inveighed bitterly against the alteration, and endeavoured to re-establish the primitive custom: while again

* Bingham, book xv, c. 5.

pope Urban the Second, in the council of Clermont, “commanded it to be so administered to the sick, (that is to say, the bread dipped in wine), *out of abundant caution, for fear the blood should at any time be spilt.*” The custom, therefore, seems to have depended upon the direction of each bishop, some commanding, some not permitting it; now a council settling, now a council unsettling it; until it finally ended by an order that the laity should be deprived altogether of the cup. This was afterwards confirmed by the council of Constance, in the fifteenth century; and while they thus put an end to the dispute whether the bread should be dipped in the wine, or whether each element should be given separately, they fell into a worse error, by totally changing the nature of the sacrament, and curtailing it of one of those parts which our Lord Himself had commanded.

In addition to the authorities above quoted, we have full testimony of the progress of error and superstition from the following authors. Lanfranc,* who writes thus: “In the appearance of bread and wine which we see, we honour invisible things, namely, the flesh and blood of Christ. Nor

* LANFRANC, born at Pavia, brought to England by William, Duke of Normandy, and made Archbishop of Canterbury; principally celebrated for his writings against Berenger: died A.D. 1089.

do we consider these two appearances from which is consecrated the body of the Lord, in the same manner before consecration as we do after consecration: for we confess, before consecration, that it is bread and wine; but while it is being consecrated it is converted into the flesh and blood of Christ.”* Rupert,† who speaks not only of transubstantiation, but also of the sacrifice made at the altar: “In the bread and wine, is *sacrificed* the Son of God, in the truth of His flesh and blood.”‡ Anselm,§ who writes as follows: “Our senses tell us one thing, our faith another; for our sight persuades that it is only bread, but our faith that it is living and vivifying flesh; our taste, that it is bread by the flavour; our hearing, that it is bread by the sound when it is broken: but our faith tells us that it is the perfect Lamb, received by the faithful.”|| Again, Theophylact¶ tells us: “The very body of the Lord is the bread which is sacrificed upon the altar, for Christ did not say, this is the figure of my body, but ‘This is my body’; but since we are infirm, and shudder to eat raw flesh, especially the flesh of men, so it *appears* bread, but

* On the Sacr. of Euch.

† RUPERT, Abbot of Duyts, near Cologne, A.D. 1111.

‡ Book vii, on Gospel of S. John.

§ ANSELM, pupil of Lanfranc, and his successor in the see of Canterbury, A.D. 1109.

|| In Heb. c. x.

¶ THEOPHYLACT, Archbishop of Acridia, A.D. 1077.

is flesh.”* Lastly, Alger,† who is equally, perhaps more decided than any of the former: “We must know, that although the water and wine is mixed at first mystically, yet, after consecration it is drunk as nothing else than blood.” And again: “We adore the sacrament as a divine thing, and we address and speak to it as a rational thing, ‘Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us’, because, it is not what it seems, but because we believe that Christ is there, as He really is.”‡

THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES.

Little now remains before we arrive at the full climax of the papal perversion of our simple sacrament. We must remember that, in the great question of the corporeal presence, though the Church had very decidedly expressed her opinion, as we saw in the case of Berenger, and the confessions of faith to which he was compelled to subscribe; still there was a great latitude allowed for private interpretation, as long as no public doctrine was maintained. “The Church had not determined, by any positive decree, the sentiments that were to be embraced in relation to this important

* In cap. xxvi, Matt. † ALGER, monk of Cluny, A.D 1135.

‡ On the Eucharist, lib. i, c. 19.

matter. It was reserved for Innocent the Third, in the Lateran Council, in the year 1215, to put an end to the liberty which every Christian had hitherto enjoyed, and to decide in favour of the most monstrous and absurd doctrine that the phrenzy of superstition was capable of inventing.”* This audacious pontiff pronounced the opinion, which is embraced this day in the Church of Rome, to be the only true and orthodox account of the matter, and he had the honour of introducing the term *transubstantiation*, which was a term hitherto absolutely unknown. The words of the Council of Lateran, by which transubstantiation is decreed, run thus:—“ There is one universal Church of the faithful, out of which no one can be saved, in which the same Jesus Christ is both priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood in the sacrament of the altar is truly contained under the figures of bread and wine ; the bread being *transubstantiated* into the body, and the wine into the blood, by the divine power.”† The change of the bread and wine, under the hands of the priest, into the actual body and blood of Christ, thus became the fixed tenet of the Roman Church ; and this being the case,—the bread or consecrated wafer, being God, it required but a few more

* Mosheim, vol. iii, p. 217.

† Conc. Lateran, A.D. 1215.

steps to proceed to the worship of that God, and so accordingly the host* was elevated before the gaze of the people. It became an object of worship, and solemn processions were made through the streets, carrying the deified bread to the sick or dying. After this decree of the Council of Lateran, there seem to be very few attempts to call in question during the thirteenth century, the doctrine of transubstantiation. There was indeed some little attempt on the part of John of Paris, towards the close of the thirteenth century, though it did not amount to any actual denial of Pope Innocent's decision. In his writings upon the Eucharist, he taught that the body of Christ was *associated* with the bread, but that the bread was not transubstantiated; on account of which he was forbidden to preach, and condemned as a heretic. With this exception, there was hardly any person of repute who expressed an opinion on the doctrines of the Eucharist. A tacit submission

* The meaning of the word host is *victim*, from *hostia*, a Latin word; and the use of the wafer, or host, instead of the common bread, arose, like the other errors of the Church of Rome, from the superstition of the bodily presence of Christ. Hospinian says, "When they first began to make these little round pieces of bread, like the Roman denarius, little hosts, or mouthfuls, cannot be certainly known. Epiphanius, who lived about the time of the Nicene council, says, that the round pieces of bread were then in use; others place it at the time of the Emperor Phocas, about the year 607; but it is certain that Gregory the Great is the first person who recorded it, about the year 590."—Hospinian, *Hist. Sacr. lib. iv, c. 6.*

seemed to pervade all ranks of men to believe any absurdity which the pope might dictate: and so things continued during the thirteenth and during the fourteenth centuries. In the midst of the general darkness which pervaded the world, there broke out indeed from time to time certain faint lights, as harbingers of better things. The Waldenses, or Vaudois, a people dwelling in the valleys of Piedmont, were remarkable as an humble sect of Christians, independent of the authority of the pope, and worshipping God in purity and holiness. Among these and a few other scattered and despised flocks, the original simplicity of the gospel was still maintained, and the spark of true light kept alive, by which, ultimately, in certain portions of the Church, the truths of primitive antiquity were restored. In England, Wickliffe, the great originator of the Reformation, began to set himself against the power of the Roman Church, and to canvass her doctrines, and to preach to the people the pure word of God. But these were solitary exceptions, single rays of light, in the midst of general darkness. Nothing as yet was able to withstand the universal dominion, both spiritual and temporal, which the Church of Rome arrogated to herself. Kings and people, clergy and laity, all were equally slaves of the so-called vicar of Christ—all were equally bound in one

vast and connected chain of ignorance, superstition, and vice. These were the dark ages, aptly so denominated. No writers are found of any purity, or of any authority. All literature is dead—all discussion is silenced—all freedom of opinion trampled and held down by the universal dominion of the Roman Church.

But we have come to the worst. We have come to the final consummation of that power, which God, no doubt for wise purposes, permitted to overwhelm the world for a season. We can hardly now enter into the idea of the real situation of the world at this time. When we speak of it as the “dark ages”, and the times of ignorance, it is not meant that *no* religion existed, or that learning had altogether ceased. The researches of modern times, and a more candid inquiry into the secret biography of individuals, has brought many things to light by which we are enabled to see, that in the very midst of all the difficulties with which religion was beset, still, here and there, devotion, piety, and learning did prevail. But it was confined, limited, known only to the few. The monks and secret ascetics kept the lamp burning, but it was in a corner. It was not set in a candlestick. But being so, perhaps it was better. It was God’s way of preserving it; for if it had been brought out before the world was

ready, it might have been quenched altogether. If religion had been too free and too open, it might have been lost; and we are sure that as God ordered it, so it must have been ordered for the best, and the unlimited power of the papacy, coupled with its temporal dominion and royal state, might just as well be, and no doubt was, the preservation of religion in its day, as the oppression and persecution of the heathen had been in a former day. Look upon this very question of the Eucharist. How miraculously has it been preserved, but through what sad perversions. The wonder is, how it ever reached us, when we contemplate the mass of error in which in the middle ages, it was on all sides involved. We have seen the original purity, simplicity, and fidelity with which our primitive Church for the first six centuries observed the celebration of the Eucharist. We have then traced the gradual decline of this simplicity in the seventh and eighth centuries, by the doctrine of image worship, and by the addition of external ceremonies, suited to the increase of wealth and temporal power which the Church had acquired. We have then gone rapidly down; rapidly as the lead that sounds the depths of the ocean, into the darkness of a sensual, depraved, and we might almost say, fanatic religion, no more like the pure, holy, and reasonable religion of Christ crucified,

than darkness is to light. We have found the Eucharist, the Christian's feast, in memory of his dying Lord, perverted into a splendid, outward, exciting display for the imagination, leaving the heart untouched. We have seen the doctrine that the bread and wine was transubstantiated into the actual body and blood of Christ by the word of the priest. We have seen the practice of the body and blood of Christ, so transubstantiated, set forth as an object of worship and adoration; the host or victim thus sacrificed, offered to the gaze of the multitude, and the people bowing the knee in prayer to a deified piece of bread of their own creating. We have seen the simple bread, which was, by our Lord's example, to *be broken*, represented by a consecrated wafer, certainly not that bread which our Lord took into His hands, and giving thanks, "blessed". We have seen the wine, of which our Lord commanded *all* to drink, totally denied to the majority of his people. We have seen the very name, "The Lord's Supper," or "EUCCHARIST," which the primitive teachers of Christianity gave to this holy sacrament, perverted and changed into that of "THE MASS;" and this mass performed not only as the communion or participation of the living in the benefits of Christ's death, but by the priest alone as a sacrifice for the benefit of the dead. We have seen the body and blood of

Jesus, as sacrificed upon the cross once for all, undergoing a new sacrifice in the hands of each individual priest, and the benefits of that sacrifice estimated and obtained, not by purity of heart, righteousness of intention, or liveliness of faith; but frequently purchased and made bargain for, by the wages of sin, and the mammon of unrighteousness.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY : FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FIFTEENTH
CENTURY TO THE PRESENT TIME.

1 COR. XI, 26.

For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew
the Lord's death *till he come*.

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

THE great historical events which distinguish the fifteenth century, are the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, and the invention of the art of printing. By the fall of Constantinople, the Christian Church in the east was destroyed, at least so far destroyed as to render it incapable of making any contest against the tenets of Rome. Christianity was expelled from the seat of her early years; the bishops and pastors of the Church were scattered and impoverished, and all further opposition to the opinions and doctrines of the west was for ever abandoned. But this loss in political strength in one quarter, was more than compensated by the increase which was now beginning to be felt in mo-

ral and intellectual power arising in another. The great invention of printing seemed at once to promise the deliverance of mankind from those bonds of superstition and ignorance which it had not been the effort of the Church of Rome either to alleviate or abolish. Information and knowledge were the only requisites which men needed, in order to fling away the additions of Popery, and to assert themselves once more the disciples of Jesus Christ. In England the followers of Wickliffe, in spite of all opposition, were rapidly increasing, under the name of Wickliffites, or Lollards. In Bohemia, John Huss, an eminent professor in the university of Prague, endeavoured openly to withdraw the university from the jurisdiction of Rome, and recommended in public the doctrines and opinions of Wickliffe. His progress, however, was not propitious. His zeal and courage only ended, as far as himself was concerned, in his discomfiture and death: but the good was not entirely lost. The numerous followers who quickly sprang up to vindicate his memory may be said to be the seeds of that great reformation which was waiting its opportunity to take root and flourish.

One of the doctrines of Huss and his followers was, that the cup in the sacrament of the Eucharist was to be administered to *all*, laity as well as

clergy; and from this circumstance they were called Calixtines, from calix, a cup, or chalice. The very name thus appropriated betrays the general opinion of the Church. It had been decidedly decreed in the twelfth century, by Pascal, that the cup was to be denied to the laity; but still some few Churches, together with Huss, now ventured to violate this decree. The anger of the papal power was in no ordinary degree called forth. Huss and Jerome of Prague were summoned to be tried for heresy. Wickliffe, whose opinions they had adopted, though long since dead, was at the same time arraigned before the spiritual tribunal of Rome; and at the great council of Constance, while Huss was condemned to be burned alive, the Church proceeded to their famous decree on the 14th of June, 1415, which ordered, that the cup was to be entirely withdrawn from the laity, and the Eucharist to be administered in one kind only. This decree, though previously understood as the doctrine of the Church, now, for the first time, received the force of law.*

* It may not be amiss, in order to remind the reader of the uncharitable supremacy from which he is now by God's grace delivered, to give a few extracts from the council of Constance, on the points above referred to,

I. Of Wickliff, A.D. 1415, Session viii:

“Wherefore the procurator fiscal being urgent, and the edict having been set forth for hearing sentence on this day; this holy

But it was all in vain. The laws, decrees, councils, and anathemas of the papal power were daily decreasing in authority. The seed had been sown, and the tree must needs grow up. The sixteenth century approached; and while the power of Rome was slumbering in unsuspecting security, its supremacy, as far as overt acts went, not disputed — its infallibility not questioned—by a mere accident, as it were, there arose from an individual voice that defiance of its

synod declares, defines, and gives judgment, that this same John Wicliffe was a notorious, pertinacious heretic, and that he died in heresy, and therefore anathematizes him, and condemns his memory. And it decrees and ordains, that his body and his bones, if they can be distinguished from other bodies and bones of the faithful, shall be dug up and cast out of the Church's sepulture, according to the canonical and lawful decrees."

II. Of communion in both kinds, Session xiii :

"Whereas in some parts of the world certain persons rashly presume to assert that Christian people ought to receive the holy sacrament of the Eucharist under both kinds of bread and wine . . . this present holy general council of Constance . . . declares, decrees, and determines, that *although Christ instituted this venerable sacrament after supper in both kinds of bread and wine, YET NOTWITHSTANDING THIS, (!)* the laudable authority of the sacred canons, and the approved authority of the Church, has observed that this sacrament ought not to be performed after supper, and in like manner that *although in the primitive Church this sacrament was received of the faithful in both kinds*, yet for the avoiding any dangers and scandal, the custom has reasonably been introduced, that it be received by the ministers under both kinds, but by the laity under the kind of bread only."

There are also decrees in this council, session xv and xxi, against John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, anathematizing and condemning them as heretics, because they followed Wicliffe in denying the above doctrines. Can folly or impiety be greater? Can want of charity and ignorant assumption be more conspicuous than in thus confessing the institution of our Lord, and yet, "*notwithstanding this*", forbidding the communion in both kinds, and exhuming the bones of the dead who had asserted it?

authority, which nations and kingdoms had not the daring to announce. A Dominical monk, of the name of Tetzels, in the year 1517, proclaimed, as was the custom of the time, a sale of indulgences,—licenses as it were,—for the remission of sins past, present, and to come. Martin Luther, a native of Eisleben, in Saxony, and a monk of the Augustinian order of Eremites, disgusted at the effrontery of this open assumption of Divine power, and unable to repress his just indignation, publicly opposed both the doctrine of indulgences and the power of the pope. This opposition on the part of a feeble and solitary monk, would have probably ended in nothing, had it not been for the injudicious management of the controversy by those whom the pope appointed to decide it. From one article of doctrine, Luther proceeded to others, and, assuming fresh courage as he advanced, the question which was originally a dispute between individuals, on Church discipline, very quickly assumed the appearance of a national and general dissension on the leading doctrines of Catholicism. The zeal of the monk was countenanced and aided by the general stream of opinion bursting forth in all directions. The matter of dispute became day by day more difficult of adjustment, until at length the pope being on the point of calling to his aid the last great exercise

of his authority, excommunication, Luther, with great adroitness, evaded the blow, and voluntarily withdrew himself from that Church, from whose communion he would otherwise have been forcibly expelled. Thus was the first great schism brought about, and thus was established that which is now generally called, from its original founder, the Lutheran Church.

The example of this great reformer was soon followed by other learned men. Princes and people swelled the ranks of the pope's opponents, until throughout the whole of Europe, but principally in Switzerland and Germany, arose so formidable a power, that it was no longer possible to check or to divert its progress.

The five greatest names who appear as founders of the new bodies, seceding from Rome, are Luther, Melancthon, Carlostadt, Zuingle, and Calvin; Luther, as we have seen, the original leader in the Reformation, Carlostadt, his colleague and companion, Melancthon, also the friend of Luther and his successor in the government of his Church, Zuingle, the founder of the reformed Church in Switzerland, and Calvin, the founder of the Church of Geneva. From these five men we may date nearly all the doctrines, and nearly all the forms of Church government, that are established in Europe; men, though varying in character and

disposition, yet all united by one bond of determination in opposing the various additions to the Catholic faith which Rome had introduced ; all men of considerable learning, unwearied zeal, and indomitable courage. Still, however, being but men, and living in times of great peril and excitement, their characters are not entirely free from question. We must not be surprised that, though they were united in the great and essential features of liberating the consciences of mankind from the tyranny of the Church of Rome, there still might linger points of personal consideration in the breasts of each, and that although they agreed in their general principles, they should disagree in points of detail. It was impossible to be otherwise. The great point of infallibility in any one man as head of the Church being given up, there remained no test by which uniformity of doctrine could be maintained. It was nothing but opinion against opinion ; and thus, unfortunately, it happened that no sooner did the greater portion of Europe separate from the communion of the Church of Rome, than there arose within itself, and between the great heads which guided the separation, an endless diversity of opinion. And more particularly did this diversity of opinion display itself in that point which it is our present object to investigate. The sacrament of the

Eucharist would naturally form a material feature in the new doctrines of the reformers; the great command of Christ stood before them, "This do in remembrance of Me." *How* then was this remembrance to be carried into effect? with all the superstition of the papal Church, or in some more pure and more scriptural form? The body and blood of Christ was to be received by the communicants. *How* was it to be received? with the notion of a corporeal and transubstantiated presence of the Saviour, or as a spiritual sacrifice and an emblematic memorial of his death? These were the great questions which they had to determine. The idolatrous worship of the host was at once put aside by *all*. The refusal of the cup to the laity was at once put aside by *all*. On these points they were unanimous. But when they came to discuss the nature of Christ's presence; when they came to analyze the manner in which the bread and wine became affected by the words of consecration; here, unfortunately, unanimity could no longer obtain.

Of the five leading reformers above mentioned, Luther, the first to throw off the dominion, seems to have remained the nearest to the peculiar tenets of the Romish Church. He maintained that the body and blood of Christ were materially and visibly present in the consecrated

elements of the Eucharist. He did not assert that any transubstantiation took place in consequence of the consecration of the priest, but that the natural presence of Christ was joined, and connected with that of the bread and wine. This opinion was usually understood under the word '*consubstantiation*,*' and was strictly maintained by Luther himself until the day of his death; and the Lutheran Church, following in his doctrine, upheld it by their doctors and public confessions.†

On the other hand Zuingle, the head of the 'Swiss Reformers, was distinctly of opinion that the bread and wine were nothing more than signs and symbols of the absent body and blood of

* This doctrine of consubstantiation was by no means originated by Luther. We read of it in the first and second book of Guitmund, who flourished in the eleventh century. Hospinian gives the following account of its origin: "After the condemnation of the doctrines of Berenger, when it was not safe any longer, on account of the cruel tyranny of the Roman priests, openly to adhere to them, while many were not able altogether to disapprove and reject them, as agreeing with the word of God and the primitive Church, yet they did not like openly to maintain them: so they found out a midway between the two, and taught that the true bread and wine after consecration remained *with* the body and blood of the Lord." Guitmund expressly calls this *Impanation*. See Hospin. Hist. Sacr., second part, p. 6, fol.

There was also another branch of this doctrine still more anomalous. "There were some who asserted that the bread was *partly* changed into the body, and *partly* remained as it was. They wished that that part of the bread which was to be received by the good, should be changed by consecration into the body, but that that part which was to be received by the wicked should not be changed."—Hosp. Hist. Sacr., lib. i. Perceiving the absurdity in this case, they blindly fell into a greater absurdity, rather than discard the doctrine altogether.

† See Hist. Conf. Augsb. by David Cheytrus.

Christ. As early as the year 1524, if not earlier, he asserted publicly, and taught this doctrine ; it may be justly denominated the leading cause of the division between the Lutheran and reformed Churches. It was in consequence of this, that when the Protestants gave in their public confession at Augsburg, there arose, in contradiction, the Tetrapolitan confession, i. e. the confession of four great towns, Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, which adhered to the opinions of Zuingle, in distinction from Luther, on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

The third of the reformers, Melancthon, who was the successor of Luther in the government of his Church, was his successor also in opinion ; though, it must be confessed, in some degree modified. The character of Melancthon was that of excessive mildness and charity, and desire of union and concord ; and if it had been in his day possible to join all the Protestant Churches under one rule of faith, by mutually conceding points of disputed tendency, and widening the enclosures of God's fold, his was undoubtedly the character to have achieved so great an object. He did, however, differ in some degree from his predecessor Luther ; for we find in many extracts of his letters, which are collected by Hospinian,* that he looked

* Hospinian, Hist. Soc., vol. ii.

upon the doctrine of consubstantiation as untrue, and even bearing the semblance of idolatry. But the mildness of his character was such that he did not consider it a matter of so great moment as to run the risk of sowing further dissensions among his Protestant brethren ; and, indeed, had he at all proceeded to enforce his individual opinion, so jealously attached were the principal directors of the Church to every doctrine of their founder, that he would only have incurred their enmity without advancing his own opinions. Even as it was, by his lenity and charitable indifference to many of those points which the Lutherans held dear, he incurred much odium ; and many of his doctrines were censured and opposed by both parties.

Next we come to Carlostadt. He at first was the friend and colleague of Luther, but soon separated from him on the same question of the Eucharist, agreeing entirely with the opinion of Zuingli that the bread and wine were to be understood as the mere signs and symbols of Christ's presence ; that the whole of the sacrament was a commemoration of Christ's death, and not a celebration of His bodily presence. In consequence of this opinion, he was banished from the territories of the Elector of Saxony, and was separated from Luther. He retired to Switzerland, where he found the opinion generally prevailing more

consonant with his own. Some time afterwards a reconciliation took place between the two reformers, but no alteration of opinion. Carlostadt remained throughout his life constant in denying the bodily presence of Christ, and the doctrine of consubstantiation.

Lastly, we come to Calvin. He differed in some respects both from Luther and from Zuingle; but if anything, according to the account of Mosheim, he seemed rather inclined to the opinions of Luther. "He acknowledged a *real*, though, *spiritual*, presence of Christ; or, in other words, that true Christians who approached the holy ordinance with lively faith were united in a certain manner to the man Christ, and that from this union the spiritual life derived new vigour in the soul, and was carried on, in a progressive motion, to a greater degree of purity and perfection," thus going higher than Zuingle and Carlostadt, but not ascending so high as Luther—denying the consubstantiation, or bodily presence, of Luther, but maintaining something more than the mere symbol of Zuingle.*

* It would seem that the doctrine of our Church approaches more nearly to Calvin than any other of the Continental Reformers above-mentioned. We certainly hold nothing like consubstantiation; but we as certainly do maintain something very nearly allied to that presence of Christ which Calvin denotes. Witness our Catechism: "What is the inward part or thing signified? The Body and Blood of Christ, which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by *the faithful*." There is, therefore, the

This point of difference was long a subject of discussion even in those churches where Zuinglé's authority prevailed; but at last, by the perseverance and learning of Calvin, his opinion triumphed so far as to effect a union between most of the Swiss Churches and that of Geneva. With the exception of Zurich and Bern, which remained for a long time constant to their founder's opinion, the remaining Churches gradually embraced the tenets of Calvin.

This, then, was the state of opinion among those illustrious men who were the originators and first promoters of the great Reformation on the continent. Unhappy it was for the Church of Christ that they could not agree in interpreting the great institution of our Lord in some one general form, so that it had not been necessary for Christians, jointly separating from the errors of the Church of Rome, themselves again to separate and subdivide,—that while they agreed in repudiating the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation

presence of Christ; but it would seem, that the presence depends, and the reception *verily* and *indeed* depends, not on the consecrating words of the priest who gives, but on the *faith* of him who receives.—See the note on p. 44.

Johnson, in his treatise entitled "The Unbloody Sacrifice," draws a close distinction between the opinions of Calvin and Luther, and says, "The Church of England does not declare for any particular *modus*; she says: '*verily* and *indeed*', but not '*how*.'" "The bread and wine are the very body and blood, though not in substance, yet in spirit, power, and effect."—See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar Unveiled, c. ii, s. 1.

and the adoration of the host, they could not avoid falling into the endless and useless frivolities of the schoolmen, in consubstantiation, impanation, and the other mystical questions of the day, so unfitted for the sacred reserve of the gospel.

But such seems the character of man's nature. Once break positive *unity*, and diversity is endless. The right of having *two* different opinions, involves of necessity the right of having *many* different opinions, and so we must cheerfully consider that, although the evils which arose from their disunion were certainly great, yet still the advantages which accrued to the human race from that freedom of opinion which produced them are more than a sufficient compensation. Immediately that the dictum of one individual ceased to be the rule of faith by which the whole Christian world was to be guided; immediately that the word of God was open for the study and interpretation of every Church according to her own authority and power, and every man had the natural right of reading and examining the Scriptures for the satisfaction of his own faith;—immediately that these unquestionable blessings descended upon mankind, it was an evil which could not by any possibility be averted, that the very same privilege, which was a blessing well used, should become a mischief when misused by the injudicious or the ignorant

—when it was turned into an exercise of critical skill, or scholastic disputation, the trial of political strength, or the watchword of a party. To all these evils, the principle of individual right to study God's word did unquestionably tend—but then what are they in comparison with the evils from which we escaped; in comparison with the ignorance, superstition, and idolatry from which we were delivered, the tyrannical supremacy and spiritual intolerance which, under God's grace, the principal countries of Europe no longer endure?

But it is now time to leave the continental nations of Europe, and to turn to our own country. We shall perceive how our present opinions on the sacrament of the Eucharist first arose, and have gradually been strengthened into their present form.

At the time that the great five reformers, whose names we have already mentioned, were commencing their great efforts against the Pope, our own country, under the reign of Henry VIII, still remained in the spiritual chains of the Roman Church. Henry VIII, as is well known, obtained the title of “Defender of the Faith,” in consequence of his defence of the Roman Catholic Church, and particularly of the seven sacraments, against the opinions of Luther.* This at once

* Henry VIII is supposed by some not to have been the

shows the natural tendency of that King to preserve the religion of his country in its ancient form ; and we also know that, in the year 1511, he advanced still further in its defence. In that year, a treaty was concluded between Henry and Ferdinand of Arragon, to maintain the papal power against the encroachments of France ; and it was evident, from a variety of circumstances, that the opinions and policy of Henry, up to this period, were in decided opposition to the new religion. But private interest and the motives of the world frequently bring about, under God's providence, national blessings ; and thus it was, when the king became desirous of dissolving his marriage

author of the "Defence of the Seven Sacraments"; but, whether or no, as it bears his name, it may be assumed as a testimony of the extreme repugnance of those in high places in England, in the reign of Henry, towards the novel doctrines of the Reformation.

In the oration made by Mr. John Clarke, the king's orator, in presenting a copy of the book to the pope, the vituperation heaped upon Luther is truly extraordinary : "Nor is it amiss to take notice in this place, of this horrid and furious monster, (Luther), as also of his stings and poisons, whereby he intends to infect the whole world. But O, immortal God, what bitter language, what so hot and inflamed force of speaking can be invented, sufficient to declare the errors of that most filthy villain ?" and so forth.

To this and such like language, the pope replied by the bull constituting the new title : "We, the true successors of S. Peter, whom Christ before His Ascension left as His vicar upon earth, and to whom He committed the care of His flock, presiding in this holy see, from which all dignity and titles have their source, we command all Christians that they name your Majesty by this title, and in their writings to your Majesty, after the word King, they immediately add, *Defender of the Faith*."—Bull of Pope Leo X.

with Katherine, and after repeated attempts failed to obtain the necessary divorce from the pope, that he then began to give his attention more seriously to the Reformation; and became desirous of absolving himself from that spiritual allegiance which it was no longer his personal interest to maintain. We have no reason to boast, either in this monarch, or in any other of the principal political movers of the Reformation, of any great purity of motive; but much, on the contrary, of which we ought to be heartily ashamed—that affects not, however, the issue of the question. God frequently uses bad men as His instruments to bring about good ends. The earthquake, the hurricane, and the flood, are evils, but they are the means of good; and so the prophet Isaiah speaks of evil men as axes and saws in the hand of the Almighty, by which He hews out and shapes His own eternal counsels.

The spirit of reform had long manifested itself in England by various demonstrations. “From the days of Wickliffe”, says Bishop Burnet, “there were many that disliked most of the received doctrines, in several parts of the nation. The clergy were at that time very hateful to the people; for as the pope did exact heavily on them, so they being oppressed, took all means possible to make the people repay what the pope wrested from them.

Wickliffe, being much encouraged and supported by the Duke of Lancaster and the Lord Percy, the bishops would not proceed against him, till the Duke of Lancaster was put from the king, and then he was condemned at Oxford. Many opinions were charged upon him, but whether he held them or not, we know not, but by the testimony of his enemies, who writ of him with so much passion that it discredits all they say. Yet he died in peace, though his body was afterwards burnt. He translated the Bible out of Latin into English, with a long preface before it, in which he reflected severely on the corruptions of the clergy, and condemned the worshipping of saints and images, and denied the corporeal presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, and exhorted all people to the study of the Scriptures." And again, he says: "As these did spread much in Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, so their books came over into England, where there was much matter already prepared to be wrought on, not only by the prejudices they had conceived against the corrupt clergy, but by the opinions of the Lollards, which had been now in England, since the days of Wickliffe, for about 150 years; between which opinions and the doctrines of the reformers there was great affinity, and therefore, to give the better vent to the books that came out of Germany, many of them were

translated into the English tongue, and were very much read and applauded.”*

This, therefore, being the state of the nation, the king had nothing further to do than to favour the doctrines and opinions which were already advancing among the people, and by that means he would constitute a religious authority independent of the pope, and more consonant to his own views, This he did, and following the advice of Cranmer, a man who appears to have been attached from his earliest years to the more liberal opinions of the Reformers, he appealed no longer to the pope, but to a council of the most learned men of his own universities. This happened in the year 1530, and the result was, that the majority gave their opinion in favour of the king's divorce. In the year 1534, (so rapidly had the principles of the Reformation advanced), an act of parliament was passed entirely abrogating the supremacy of the pope within the dominions of the king of England; and shortly after, another act was passed, pronouncing the king the supreme head of the Church of England. This great event was not, however, brought about without much difficulty nor without bloodshed. The cruelty of the clergy was excessive. Many accused of favouring the Reformation had been brought to the stake, among whom were

* Burnet, Hist. Ref. book ii.

Tindal, who had published a translation of the New Testament, Bilney, and more particularly John Frith,* who seems to have been one of the first English reformers who preached against the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. This first denial of the Romish doctrine of the mass, is worthy of our notice. The substance of his arguments is given by Bishop Burnet: "That Christ, in the sacrament, gave eternal life, but the receiving of the bare sacrament did not give eternal life, since many took it to their damnation; therefore, Christ's presence there was only felt by faith: this being further proved by the fathers before Christ, who did eat the same spiritual food, and drink of the rock, which was Christ, according to S. Paul. Since then, they and we communicate in the same thing, and it was certain that they did not eat Christ's flesh corporeally, but fed by faith on a *Messias to come*, as Christians do on a *Messias*

* Bilney suffered martyrdom in the year 1527, Frith in the year 1533. Together with Frith, a young man, by name Andrew Hewet, was brought before the Bishop of London, and being asked, "What he thought touching the Lord's Supper", answered, "Even as John Frith doth:" and then, being asked, "Dost thou not believe that it is really the body of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary?" answered, "So do I not believe": and for this these two martyrs perished together. Tindal though an Englishman, did not suffer in England. Persecution followed him for the same heretical opinions out of England to the continent. He died near Antwerp, in the year 1535.

These are but samples of multitudes upon multitudes who perished in opposing the doctrines of Rome, and whose principal error was, the denial of the bodily presence of Christ, and the other blasphemous doctrines of the mass.—See Fox, Burnet, etc.

already come ; ' therefore we now do only communicate by faith. He also insisted much on the signification of the word sacrament, from whence he concluded that the elements must be the mystical signs of Christ's body and blood, for if they were truly the flesh and blood of Christ, they should not be sacraments ; he concluded that the ends of the sacrament were these three :—by a visible action to knit the society of Christians together in one body,—to be a means of conveying grace upon our due participating of them,—and to be remembrances to stir up men to bless God for that unspeakable love which in the death of Christ appeared to mankind. To all these ends, the corporeal presence of Christ availed nothing, they being sufficiently answered by a mystical presence ; yet he drew no other conclusion from these premises, but that the belief of the corporeal presence in the sacrament was no necessary article of our faith. This either flowed from his not having yet arrived at a sure persuasion in the matter, or that he chose in that modest style to encounter an opinion, of which the world was so fond, that to have opposed it in downright words would have given prejudices against all that he could say."*

In the year 1573, a book appeared, giving an account of the dispute maintained between Frith

* Burnet, Hist. Ref. book ii,

and Sir Thomas More. In this dispute Frith confirmed what he had before asserted. He proved from Scripture, “ that after the consecration, the elements were still bread and wine, and were so called both by our Saviour and His apostles ; that our senses shew they are not changed in their natures, but that they are still subject to corruption, which can in no way be said of the body of Christ. He proved that the eating of Christ’s flesh, in the sixth of S. John, cannot be applied to the sacrament, since the wicked receive it, who yet do not eat the flesh of Christ, otherwise they should have eternal life. He shewed, also, that the sacrament coming in the room of the Jewish paschal lamb, we must understand Christ’s words, ‘ This is my body’, in the same sense in which it was said that the lamb was the Lord’s passover. He confirmed this by many passages from Tertulian, Ambrose, and many other fathers. He brought likewise several testimonies to shew that they knew nothing of the *consequences* that follow transubstantiation ; of a body being in more than one place at once ; or being in a place after the manner of a spirit, or of the worship to be given to the sacrament. From hence it may appear upon what solid and weighty reasons they then began to shake the received opinion of transubstantiation, and with how much learning this

controversy was managed by him who first undertook it.”*

In consequence of these opinions, Frith was tried and condemned before the bishop of London. In the year 1534, he suffered martyrdom at the stake; and these words stand in the register of his confession: “Frith thinketh and judgeth that the natural body of Christ is not in the sacrament of the altar, but in one place only at once.”

Such were the violence and persecution with which the opponents of the Romish tenets were assailed. The clergy naturally were averse to any innovation, and clung more closely to every doctrine in which the Church had trained them. But the opposition was not only on the part of the clergy. The king had opposed the pope solely for political purposes, not for religious opinions, and therefore he also still continued to maintain all the leading articles of the Romish Church. Having made himself conspicuous by his writings against Luther, he was loth after so short an interval to become his advocate, and we may very easily suppose that the freedom of opinion, and the tendency to call in question ancient ordinances, which seemed the necessary fruit of the Reformation, was anything but acceptable to so tyrannical a monarch as Henry. This was so much the case

* Burnet, Hist. Ref. book ii.

that had it not been for Cranmer, who became a great favourite with the king in consequence of his successful advice in the matter of the divorce, and had it not also been for Anne Boleyn, the new queen, both of whom were zealously in favour of the Reformers, it is very questionable whether they would eventually have made any head against the superstition and tyrannical cruelty with which they were beset by the adherents of the pope. And even as it was, the progress which the Reformation made was very faint and very gradual. We have seen one man (the first who dared to broach the doctrine in England) a martyr at the stake, for denying the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist. This was in the year 1534. Two years subsequently, the bishops, with Cranmer, met together to consult on religious subjects, and drew up certain articles of faith, and as this was the first attempt at composing any articles of faith, distinctively of the Church of England, it is worth while to notice the opinion of the Church on the controverted question of the Eucharist. The fourth article was as follows: "As touching the sacrament of the altar, people were to be instructed, that under the forms of bread and wine, *there was truly and substantially given the very same body of Christ that was born of the Virgin Mary*, and therefore it was to be received with all reverence, every

one duly examining himself, according to the words of S. Paul." This article was signed by Cromwell, Cranmer, seventeen other bishops, forty abbots and priors, and fifty archdeacons and proctors. Thus we see, as far as the year 1536, very little advance had been made.

In 1539, we find an act of parliament, in which are contained the following propositions, decreed as the law of the Church: "First, that in the sacrament of the altar, after the consecration, there remained no substance of bread and wine, but under these forms, the natural body and blood of Christ were present: Secondly, that communion in both kinds was not necessary to salvation, but that both the flesh and blood of Christ were together in each of the kinds: Fifthly, that the use of private masses ought to be continued, which, as it was agreeable to God's law, so men received great benefit by them."—Still not much advance.

The next year, 1540, another commission was appointed, in which Cranmer proposed that the sacraments should be considered as two. But the popish party being as yet too strong, the former number, seven, was retained; and in the explanation of the Eucharist, transubstantiation was again fully asserted, as also "the concomitancy of the blood with the flesh, so that communion in both kinds was not necessary; and the use of hearing

mass, though one did not communicate, was also asserted.”*—Still not much advance.

In 1546, we find persecution still raging against the Reformers. Shaxton, who was bishop of Salisbury, had asserted that Christ's body and blood were not in the sacrament, but that they were a sign and memorial of His body that was crucified for us. Upon this he was indicted and condemned to be burnt. This opinion, it is true, he afterwards recanted, and at the instance of the king and the bishops of London and Worcester, signed articles of faith, directly contradicting his former assertion. Still, the indictment and prosecution display the spirit of the time. In the same year, a woman of the name of Anne Askew, of good birth, and considerable education, suffered martyrdom. Information was given that she had spoken against the corporeal presence; she was cited before the bishop of London, and compelled to sign a recantation according to the bishop's dictation, stating, that “the natural body of Christ was present in the sacrament after the consecration, whether the priest were a good or ill man, and that whether it was presently consumed or reserved in the *Pix*,† it was the true body of Christ.” But even this was not sufficient; she was carried

* Burnet.

† The *Pix* was a little box or chest, in which the consecrated host was preserved.

to the Tower, *and laid upon the rack*, for it appeared that she qualified her recantation, by subscribing to it the following words: “that as to the Lord’s Supper she believed so much as Christ had said in it, and as much as from Him the Catholic Church did teach.” For this, after suffering the torments of the rack under the very eyes, and some say the *hands* of the king’s chancellor, (for it is asserted that he himself stretched the cords in order to extract the desired confession,) she was carried to the stake at Smithfield, and there, together with three men, John Belenian, John Adams, and John Lassels, she was burned to death; their crime being the denial of the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament. Further, there is a curious letter of the king, in Latin, to the German ambassador upon the point of denying the cup to the laity. “Nor can we persuade ourselves that you do not believe, together with us, that under the likeness of bread there is *substantially* and *really*, the true and living body of Christ, and together with His body, His true blood; otherwise we must confess that His body would be without blood, which it would be wicked to say, since that the flesh of Christ is not only living but the cause of life, and that under the likeness of wine, not only is there the true and living blood of Christ, but also together with the true blood, the living

and true flesh of His body ; and since this is the case, it necessarily follows that those who communicate in one kind, and only receive the body of Christ under the likeness of bread, are not deprived of the communion of the blood of Christ ; and that they who communicate in the likeness of wine are not deprived of the communion of the body of Christ.* And then he proceeds at considerable length to shew, that the refusal of the cup to the laity is not at all unreasonable, but, on the contrary, strictly in accordance with the command of Christ and the apostles.

In the year 1547, Henry VIII died, and under his successor, Edward, the Reformation, in spite of the untoward oppositions just detailed, made onwards her sure and certain steps. The ancient error, alluded to in the king's letter, met with a signal refutation in the very first year of the young king's reign. An act was passed by which "the value of the holy sacrament, commonly called the sacrament of the altar, and in scripture the Supper of the Lord, was set forth, together with its first institution:" and after various other recitals, it was said: "It being more agreeable to Christ's first institution, and the practice of the Church for five hundred years after Christ, that the sacrament should be given in both the kinds of bread and

* Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet's addenda.

wine, rather than in one kind only,—therefore, it was enacted, that it should be commonly given in both kinds, except necessity did otherwise require it, and it being also more agreeable to the first institution, and the primitive practice, that the people should receive with the priest, than that the priest should receive alone; therefore, the day before every sacrament, an exhortation was to be made to the people to prepare themselves for it, in which the benefits and danger of worthy and unworthy receiving, were to be expressed, and the priests were not, without a lawful cause, to deny it to any who humbly asked it.”* The next year (1548), the whole of the offices in the Church were examined and amended by a committee of nineteen bishops and six doctors. The office of the sacrament of the Eucharist held the prominent place in this examination. “But they did not at once mend every thing that required it, but left the office of the mass as it was, only adding to it that which made it a communion. It began first with an exhortation to be used the day before, which differs not much from that now used, only after the advice given concerning confession, it is added, that such as desire to make auricular† confession should not

* Burnet, part ii, book iii.

† The doctrine of auricular confession, and absolution, consequent upon it, is evidently one of the most politic, as it is one of the most tyrannical, of the doctrines of the Roman Church. The

censure those who were satisfied with a general confession to God, and that those who used only confession to God and to the Church, should not be offended with those who used auricular confession to a priest—but that all should keep the rule of charity, every man being satisfied to follow his own conscience, and not judging another man in things not appointed by God. After the confession,

Church of England leaves the confession of one man to another, his spiritual adviser, to the good pleasure of each individual (see the rubric, at the service of the sick), desiring the priest to move the sick man to confess, but going no further; whereas the Church of Rome makes it compulsory.

This notion was first originated by Hugo, A.D. 1130: "I boldly say, that if any one approach the communion of the body and blood of the Lord before the absolution of the priest, he certainly eats and drinks damnation to himself." The fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, implicitly enjoins auricular confession: "Let every faithful person, of both sexes, after he has come to years of discretion, make solitary confession of all his sins, at least once in the year, to his own priest, and study to the utmost to fulfil the penance enjoined him.....otherwise, let him while living be denied entrance into the Church, and at death be deprived of Christian burial." It will be sufficient to add the canon of the Council of Trent, following up the same doctrine: "If any shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted, and is necessary, for salvation, by divine right; or shall say that the custom of confessing secretly to the priest alone, which the Catholic Church has always observed from the beginning, and now observes, is repugnant to the institution and command of Christ, and is only of human invention—let him be accursed."—Council of Trent, Sacrament of Repentance, canon 6; and the 7th and 9th canons are equally strong.

The evils which must of necessity arise from this forced auricular confession, and particularly in the manner of the examination, by which the priest is directed to inquire even into the secret thoughts of the sinner, are in every sense most revolting. Let the reader only consult "*Dens' Theology*"—a book which has latterly, since popery has assumed a more open attempt once more to deceive the people of England with her ancient errors, attracted considerable notice. May God avert the evil devices of this enemy of true religion, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

absolution, and the prayer beginning, "We do not presume", the sacrament was to be given in both kinds, first to the ministers then present, and then to all the people, with these words: "*The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life; and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life.*" The bread was to be such as had been formerly used, and every one of the breads so consecrated was to be broken into two or more pieces, and the people were to be taught that there was no difference in the quantity they received, whether it was small or great, but that in each of them they received the whole body of Christ. If the wine that was at first consecrated did not serve, the priest was to consecrate more, but all to be without any elevation. This office being thus finished, there was set forth a proclamation, reciting, that whereas the parliament had enacted that the communion should be given in both kinds to all the king's subjects, it was now ordered to be given in the form here set forth, and all were required to receive it with due reverence and Christian behaviour.*

In this form one thing is observable: the words on giving the bread are, "*preserve thy body*", on

* Burnet, Hist. Ref., part ii, book i.

giving the chalice, "*preserve thy soul*". But Cranmer, being ready to change any thing for which he saw reason, subsequently made an alteration, so that in both it might be said, "*preserve thy body and soul*." The offertory was to be made by bread, and wine mixed with water. In the consecration prayer the following words were used: "With thy holy Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son." All elevation was forbidden: the bread was to be unleavened, round, having no print upon it, and somewhat thicker than it was formerly. A litany was also used, consisting of many suffrages, much the same as those at present in use, with one remarkable addition, considering the close approximation of the contending parties—namely, "to be delivered from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities."

And yet, with all these changes and improvements, the doctrine of transubstantiation remained untouched. The only points gained were the communion in both kinds, and the cessation of private masses; but in the year 1549, public discussions arose on this point also. There was no opinion for which the adherents of Rome contended more ignorantly and eagerly, and that the people

generally believed more blindly and firmly, than the doctrine of transubstantiation: various shades and modifications of the doctrine they might endure, such as those which the Lutheran and Swiss Churches had already established—but that all notions of that mysterious change which they had so long been taught to consider essential to the sacrament, should be entirely set aside, could not be made a matter of popular belief without much time, and infinite difficulty. But now, even upon this strong-hold of popish error, public disputations were held both at Oxford and Cambridge. Peter Martyr held a public disputation before the commissioners sent by the king, the bishops of Lincoln, and some others, in which these three propositions were canvassed:—

“1. In the sacrament of thanksgiving there is no transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.

“2. The body or blood of Christ is not carnally or corporeally in the bread and wine, nor, as others used to say, *under* the bread and wine.

“3. The body and blood of Christ are united to the bread and wine sacramentally.”

This was at Oxford. At Cambridge, Ridley was sent down with different commissioners to dispute on the following heads:—

“1. Transubstantiation cannot be proved by

the plain and manifest words of scripture, nor can it be necessarily collected from it, nor yet confirmed by the consent of the ancient fathers.

“2. In the Lord’s Supper, there is none other oblation and sacrifice than of a remembrance of Christ’s death, and thanksgiving.”

Nor was it by word of mouth alone that these disputations were carried on. Cranmer wrote and published a collection of all the arguments against transubstantiation, while Gardiner took the contrary side. The substance of Cranmer’s arguments was as follows: “Christ in the institution took bread and gave it. So that His words, ‘*This is my body*’, could only be meant of the bread; now the bread could not be his body literally. He Himself also calls the cup the fruit of the vine. S. Paul calls it, the bread that we break, and the cup that we bless; and speaking of it after it was blessed, calls it ‘*that bread and that cup*’. For the reason of that expression, ‘*This is my body*’, it was considered that the disciples to whom Christ spoke thus, were Jews, and that they, being accustomed to the Mosaical rites, must needs have understood His words in the same sense they did Moses’ words concerning the paschal lamb, which is called ‘The Lord’s passover.’ It was not so literally, for the Lord’s passover was the angel’s passing by the Israelites when he smote the first born of the

Egyptians. So the lamb was only the Lord's passover, as it was the *memorial* of it; and thus Christ, substituting the Eucharist for the paschal lamb, used such an expression, calling it His body, in the same manner of speaking as the lamb was called the Lord's passover. This was plain enough, for his disciples could not well understand Him in any other sense than that to which they had been formerly accustomed. In the scripture many such figurative expressions occur frequently. In baptism, the other sacrament instituted by Christ, He is said to baptise '*with the Holy Ghost and fire*', and such as are baptised are said to '*put on Christ*', which were figurative expressions; as also in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the cup is called the new testament in Christ's blood, which is an expression full of figure. Further it was observed that that sacrament was instituted for a *remembrance of Christ*, and of *His death*, which implied that He was to be *absent* at the time when He was to be remembered. Nor was it simply said, that the elements were His body and blood, but that they were His body *broken*, and His blood *shed*; that is, they were there as suffering on the cross, which as they could not be understood literally, (for Christ did institute this sacrament before He had suffered on the cross), so now Christ must be present in the sacrament, not as glorified in heaven,

but as suffering on the cross. From those places where it is said that Christ is in heaven, and that He is to continue there, they argued that He was not to be any more upon earth; and those words in the sixth of S. John, of '*eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood*,' they said they were to be understood, not of the sacrament, (since many received the sacrament unworthily, and of them it cannot be said that they have eternal life in them,) but Christ there said of them that received Him in the sense that was meant in that chapter, that all that *did so eat His flesh had eternal life in them*; therefore these words can only be understood *figuratively* of receiving Him by *faith*, as Himself there explains it: and so in the end of that discourse, finding that some were startled at that way of expressing Himself, He gave a key to the whole, when He said His words were '*spirit and life*,' and that the *flesh* profited nothing: it was the *spirit* that quickened."* From this they went on to examine the ancient fathers, and deduced the gradual corruption of this doctrine in the dark ages down to the fourth council of Lateran by pope Innocent; showing that it had originated in the ignorance of mankind, and in the desire of the Roman Church to arrogate power, and to mystify the simple rites of Christianity by the

* See Burnet, part ii. book i.

pomps and pageantry which were introduced into its services.

In the year 1550, the new opinions, by the help of free discussion, and the learned arguments above displayed by Cranmer, and the other principal reformers, began to make considerable impression on the people. Ridley, bishop of London, made a visitation of his diocese, and issued many injunctions in regard to several superstitions of the mass still remaining—"Such were washing their hands at the altar, holding up the bread, licking the chalice, blessing their eyes with the paten* or sudary, and many other relics of the mass." But that which was most new was, that there having been great contests about the form of the Lord's board, whether it should be made as an altar, or as a table,† therefore since the form of a table was more likely to turn the people from the supersti-

* The paten was an open dish or plate, from the Latin *patena*, in which the host was reserved. The sudary was a small napkin, or handkerchief.

† Bishop Andrewes says, "If we agree about the matter of sacrifice, there will be no difference about the altar, the holy Eucharist being considered as a sacrifice (in the representation of the breaking of the bread and the pouring of the cup), the same is fitly called an *altar*, which again is as fitly called a *table*, the Eucharist being considered as a sacrament, which is nothing else than a distribution of the sacrifice to the service of the receivers." And Mede says, "The seat or raised fabric appointed for the setting and celebration of this holy mystery, was, *the holy table*, or *altar*, for by both these names hath that sacred *biere* (as I may call it) of the Body and Blood of Christ, been ever promiscuously and indifferently called in the Church."—Mede *on the name of Altar*, sect. i.

tion of the popish mass, and to the right use of the Lord's Supper, he exhorted the curates and churchwardens to have it in the fashion of a table, decently covered, and to place it in such part of the quire or chancel as should be most meet, so that the ministers and communicants should be separated from the rest of the people; and that they should put down all by-altars."

In the year 1551, several alterations were made in the liturgy, many more of the rites and ceremonies hitherto in use were abolished, namely the use of oil in baptism, the unction of the sick, prayers for souls departed, both in the communion office, and in that for the burial of dead, the invocation of the Holy Ghost in the consecration of the Eucharist and the prayer of oblation: the rubric that ordered water to be mixed with wine, was omitted, several other less material variations were made: the Vestments also that were prescribed in the former book were not mentioned in this. The book in which these alterations appeared, was called the second book of Edward VI., or the book of the fifth year of Edward VI., and is very nearly the same as that which we now use.

In the year 1552 the most important point was the drawing up of the articles of the church, agreed upon by the bishops and other learned men, in a convocation held in London.

Of these articles, which were in number forty-two, the twenty-ninth and thirtieth are as follow :—

ARTICLE XXIX.

“ The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have amongst themselves one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ’s death, insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break, is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ. Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy writ, but it is repugnant to the plain words of scripture,* and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

“ *Since the very being of human nature doth require that the body of one and the same Christ is given, man cannot be at one and the same time taken, and eaten in many places, but of necessity must be only after an in some certain and determinate place ; heavenly and therefore, the body of Christ cannot be spiritual manner, and the present in many different places at the same time ; and since (as the holy scriptures testify) Christ hath been taken up*

into heaven, and there is to abide till Christ is received and eaten
the end of the world, it becometh not any in the Supper
of the faithful to believe or profess that is faith.
there is a real or corporeal presence (as they
phrase it) of the body and blood of Christ in the
*Eucharist.**

“ The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.”

ARTICLE XXX.

“ The offering of Christ once made is a perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone; wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or *Blasphemous*. guilt, were* fables and dangerous deceits.”

Also, in the same year, many additions were made to the book of Common Prayer, among which was a rubric in the office of the Com-

* The passages in italics are the *omissions* in the Articles of 1562. The passages in the margin are the *additions* made in the Articles of 1562.

munion, explaining the reason of kneeling at the reception of the Eucharist. It was thereby declared, that "that gesture was kept up as a most reverent and humble way of expressing our great sense of the mercies of God in the death of Christ then communicated to us, but that thereby there was no adoration intended to the bread and wine, which would be gross idolatry; nor did they think the very flesh and blood of Christ was present, since His body, according to the nature of all other bodies, could be only in one place at once, and so He being now in heaven, could not be corporeally present in the sacrament."

Thus far, and thus gradually, had the great reformation advanced, and more particularly those important doctrines which depend upon a right understanding of the Eucharist, when the reign of Edward was prematurely closed. In the loss of this prince himself the church of England had much to regret; but when we consider the advisers by whom he was surrounded, and the general tendency of the measures then in progress, it may be questioned whether the sudden close of his reign did in reality save the church from many evils. A true reform of abuses must be slow, specially when those abuses refer to a matter so vitally affecting the human heart as religion. Somerset, the protector, was at heart a

Zuinglian. Many other advisers of the crown were rather thinking of the riches of the church than of its purification, and how the plunder of her stores might pass into their own hands. So says Heylin: "Some great men about the Court, under colour of removing corruptions in the church, had cast their eyes upon the spoil of shrines and images, and the improving of their own fortunes by the chantry lands, all of which they most sacrilegiously divided among themselves." With such a spirit as this, it is evident that no blessing could ultimately have attached to the reformation of the church. In liturgical matters it was little otherwise. The first book of Edward retained the catholic forms of prayer and all forms and observances which were primitive and pure, abandoning only the abuses of Rome; but in the second we find a considerable loss, and an evident tendency to descend to much lower ground of doctrine, showing, as it were, a possibility that the church might in its hatred of Popery have abandoned Catholicism. The sudden death then of Edward might have been a benefit, inasmuch as this downward tendency was arrested, and time given for reflection. The adverse power being again brought to the head of affairs, ancient customs and ancient principles were again reviewed, and all that was old, and really sterling

and good, saved from the hands of mere mercenary courtiers and time-serving politicians. Queen Mary succeeded. This princess, bigoted by education and by habit, to the superstitions of popery, lost no opportunity of forcing back the nation to its former dependence on the church of Rome; and to effect this purpose, no means were left unused. During her reign, the Reformation not only made no progress, but having to contend against the secular power which was exerted against it with no sparing hand, it was purified and exalted in its principles, and all that was suspicious as arising from personal and temporal motives was taken away. Hypocrisy was brought to light, sincerity was proved, and though weakness for a time paralyzed the efforts of the church, yet that very weakness ultimately proved its strength. Death and martyrdom were the sure rewards of him who dared either to speak or to act against the doctrines of the new queen. Still, however, the public opinion, and men's affections, though forbidden open expression, were secretly fomented and cherished in favour of the more enlightened doctrines which they had just begun to understand: and perhaps, as in the primitive times in the case of heathen persecutions, the blood of the martyrs was said to be the seed of the church, so the violent and cruel proceedings of this reign tended,

under the direction of God's grace, ultimately to advance those great blessings which we now inherit. Such men as Bonner and Gardiner may, perhaps, be esteemed as great promoters of the Reformation as Cranmer and Ridley. "All things work together for good to them that love God."

The reign of Mary was but short. In 1558 Queen Elizabeth succeeded, and her first business was to undo everything which had been done by her sister, and to restore the nation to its previous state under Edward. All the doctrines and reforms which had then been commenced, were now resumed, and those learned and pious men who had escaped the stake by flying for refuge to foreign countries, once more revisited their native land, and, under the direction of the queen, renewed the interrupted work of the English reformation. Great caution, however, was still requisite. The desire of the reformers was to embrace as large a portion of the nation as possible under the established religion; they wished to make allowance for long-standing habits: they would rather win over the multitude by concessions to their feelings than by violent opposition. They did not take up the doctrines of the continental Reformation, but rather assumed a distinct ground of their own, not separating from the church of Rome or causing a schism in the flock of Christ,

but rather so preserving unity, as to assert their right to a national reform as a branch of the church catholic. They shrunk therefore from the name of "Protestant," and adhered faithfully to that of "Catholic." They would not desire a party in the nation to side with them, but the whole. It was not the reform of a sect, but that of a nation and a church.

It was under this spirit that many things inserted in Edward's liturgy were now placed on a different footing.

It was proposed to have the communion book so contrived that it should not exclude the belief of the corporeal presence; for the chief design of the queen's council was, to unite the nation in one faith, and *the greatest part of the nation continued to believe in such a presence*. Hereupon the rubric that explained the reason for kneeling at the sacrament: "*That thereby no adoration is intended to any corporeal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood,*" was now omitted. The expression used at the delivery of the elements, in King Edward's liturgy, was as follows: "*The body [or blood] of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body [or soul] unto everlasting life.*" These words had been left out in his second liturgy, as favouring the corporeal presence too much, and the following was substituted in giving the bread: "Take,

and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving:"—and in giving the wine: "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." But now these two sentences were joined into one, so that the former—"The body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," might give countenance to those who believed in the corporeal presence, and the latter might satisfy those who could not reconcile that faith with their consciences. Also, instead of the forty-two Articles of Edward, Elizabeth gave her royal assent to thirty-nine. The points of difference in regard to the Eucharist were very conspicuous. In the articles of 1552, it was asserted, "that a faithful man ought not either to believe, or openly confess, the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." This passage was now omitted, in order that they who cherished the doctrine of the bodily presence might not be offended. But as, for charity's sake, these expressions in the articles of Queen Elizabeth were not so decided in their renunciation of the bodily presence; so, on the other hand, there were two new articles inserted, which seemed to strengthen the doctrines of

the ultra-Protestant party. These were the twenty-ninth and thirtieth, as follows:—

The 29th. “The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as S. Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing.”

The 30th. “The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people, for both the parts of the Lord’s sacrament, by Christ’s ordinance, and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.”

The first of these new articles is very decided in its expression, for it calls the bread and the wine the *sign* of so great a thing, that is, the *sign* of the body and blood of Christ, and it at once repudiates the notion, by whomsoever held, of the *opus operatum*, the notion that by the mere eating or drinking, the benefits of the sacrament might be obtained: and this is still further confirmed in another article of the same date:—“The mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten is faith.”

Meanwhile, the Roman church had not been idle. That the division between the two parties might be distinctly marked,—that all the terrors of

anathema might be hurled at those who had thus dared to contradict the opinions of Rome, the Council of Trent,—the last great council of the Roman church,—had been continuing its sessions from time to time. From the year A.D. 1545, to the year 1563, had this council been laying down the laws and canons of the Roman church. On every doctrine relating to the Eucharist,—confession, transubstantiation, communion in one kind, elevation of the host, sacrifice of the mass, solitary masses, does she in this council confirm the errors of her creed, and at once condemn herself, by her own shewing, of a total declension from the primitive and apostolical customs and opinions of the church. There stand to this very day, the decrees of this council, as the test and authority of the church of Rome, even as our own articles are of the church of England; and until some fresh synod of its bishops shall be convened to remodel and alter this system of faith, the church of Rome must be considered as abiding in the opinions there expressed: in which case, every member of the Anglican, as well as every member of the Greek, communion is under anathema, and every father of the church antecedent to the seventh century, is pronounced heretical.

But while the Romanists have thus declined from primitive truth, we, thanks be to the Almighty,

have returned, undeceived by their fallacies, and undeterred by their frowns, to the bosom of that pure and apostolical church which Jesus founded. May God, in his own good time, grant that they also may see the light, and become with us children of the gospel, in the bond of peace, and in union of faith.

But little now remains to be told. The reign of Elizabeth continued to the commencement of the seventeenth century. Here, therefore, we may justly pause; and hence we may, in conclusion, review the wonderful advance in religious knowledge which this era has witnessed. We were delivered from all the superstitious ceremonies connected with the celebration of the mass, the whispering at the prayer of consecration, the anointing and washing of the hands, the ringing of bells, the consecrated wafer treasured up from day to day, the bowing and kneeling before images, and in short, the whole of that absurd system of the popish priesthood, by which they amused the fancy, and deceived the imagination of the multitude. In the place of these over-cumbersome ceremonies, we established a plain and devotional service, a manly and simple doctrine, intelligible to the senses, and open to the understandings of the people; and this service has remained, with very few alterations, as it was

restored in the time of Elizabeth, unto the present day. How these blessings arose, first on the continent, and then in our own country, we have gradually traced. The various shades of opinion of the leading reformers of Germany and Switzerland, the obstructions which arose from the political circumstances of the time, the checks which they received from the changes of dynasty that occurred during their progress, and above all, the difficulties with which they had to contend from the grossness of ignorance, and inveteracy of prejudice under which the world was labouring; all these are points of the closest interest to the Christian as well as to the historian. The closer we examine, and the more we read, the more satisfied shall we be that our great reformers have justly restored the sacrament of the Eucharist to that plain and simple ceremony of memorial and spiritual sacrifice, which our blessed Lord intended. The Lord's Supper became, as it was originally appointed by the Saviour, a spiritual memorial of his death, and a sacrifice of thanksgiving, rather than a pompous pageant for the gaze of an ignorant multitude. The wine was no longer confined to the clergy, but given equally to all. The bread was no longer a wafer, but the actual food of which we daily partake, and such as we believe our Lord Himself brake and blessed

at the last supper. The elements were no longer held up for worship and adoration, but were considered, as our Lord intended, holy emblems spiritually conveying that body and that blood which were broken and poured forth for the sins of the world; in short, we returned, after a lapse of many centuries of the grossest darkness and perversion of God's word, to the original purity of the institution; we became again in the sacrament of the Eucharist, rational creatures, celebrating the memory of Christ's death with faith and spiritual devotion. We no longer paid the wages of corruption for the passage of our soul from death to salvation, but we looked upon the bread and wine as representing, merely, and commemorating that great sacrifice which was made once for all; and we remembered the scripture which said, "Christ, our high priest, not by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood entered *once* into the holy place. Neither hath he *often* suffered since the foundation of the world, but now *once* hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."

Eighteen hundred years have passed away since that awful moment when our blessed Lord, in anticipation of His own cruel death, took bread in His hands and brake it, and said, "*This is my body,*" and the cup, saying, "*Drink ye all of it.*"

In the passage of these eighteen hundred years, how have we seen the passions and the ignorance, the ambition and the tyranny of men at work perverting and corrupting His most holy words. How have we seen doctrines and practices gradually arising in contradiction of primitive usage, and forced upon the whole church by the see of Rome, as a condition of her communion. We have now seen in this rapid and imperfect sketch the main features of this great controversy. If we compare our present doctrine in the church of England, with that which was the doctrine of the Apostles and the whole church until the seventh century; and then cast our view upon the Council of Trent;—*Which* (let any candid examiner say) has more the features and resemblance of Christ Jesus our Lord—the *English* catholic church or the *Roman*?

That there are not some things which we have to regret in the restoration of the doctrines and practices of our holy Eucharistic feast, as it is in England—some points where we might have done better than we have done, and more strictly in accordance with the primitive liturgies, it would be foolish to say: but upon a general review of the main questions, the nature of the real presence, the cessation of solitary masses, the giving of the chalice to the laity, the oblations, prayers,

and hymns; whether in all these points, we are not far more in accordance with the church in her early purity, than the practices of Rome are, we may safely appeal to the testimony of historical fact.

Such has been the object of this investigation. That the struggles of our church in attaining what she has attained, have been great; that our position as a national church has not been gained without suffering, without many heart-rending scenes of bitterness and animosity, and injustice on both sides; without, above all, a breach of that which every Christian ought to hold most dear, *UNITY*; that many vicissitudes as we have struggled on have attended our steps, on one side beaten down by the force of *power*, on the other by the force of *prejudice*, these things all men who read and think, know full well.

But it may be questioned *which* has produced the greater danger to us, *power* or *prejudice*. Power on the side of Rome when she possessed it, or prejudice on the side of Puritanism, which even still exists.

If against the one (Rome) we have to appeal to primitive usage, that principle is met with the antagonist principle of the church's infallibility. If against the other (Puritanism) we appeal to each national church's right to pronounce authorita-

tively on matters of disputed doctrine, so long as she pronounces in harmony with scripture and with the ancient fathers, that principle is met by the antagonist principle of the right of private judgment. *Power* as an argument of doctrine, is in this country (praise be to God) *gone*, but prejudice remains. What the church of England has to fear now is not on the side of Rome, but on the side of PURITANISM. Not lest we go too far in the doctrines of the real presence and reverence for the holy sacrament—but lest we fall too short; not lest we behold devout communicants thronging the steps of the altar of the Lord, “in reverence and godly fear,” receiving of the Lord’s body and the Lord’s blood after a heavenly and mystical manner—but lest profane and ungodly intruders make the eating and drinking in that holy feast, a mere *memorial*, not a Eucharist—a mere *act of worship*, not a means of grace; lest they look upon those clergy who faithfully adhere to the devotional observances which the liturgy directs, as striving after popery, whereas they are in reality its stanchest opponents, and its most unflinching enemies; lest with these prejudices full, and not knowing the difference between what is CATHOLIC and what is ROMAN, they abandon her communion in anger, and multiply the ranks of Dissent in self-righteousness.

But we will leave the past. That past can never recur. The art of printing, even if it stood by itself, renders it impossible. Only behold the course of history as now detailed. Only consider our church restored to the primitive and apostolic purity of its early days, (at least in the theory and doctrine of this its most important ceremonial.) There is exacted of the Christian community no irrational profession of belief: there is required now no credit in the fables of papal dominion: there is demanded now no worship of the host, no falling down before the material elements of our own creating. The church, as it is now "built upon the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head-corner stone," requires of us merely to offer bread and wine on the holy altar by the hands of a priest, and by that priest to consecrate that bread and wine and make it holy unto God, considering that by that consecration it becomes to the faithful the real body and the real blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, in a spiritual and heavenly manner; and then it requires the laity to eat and drink of that body and that blood as an act, first of holy communion with God and with themselves, and secondly of sacrificial thanksgiving, that we *may shew the Lord's death* TILL HE COME;" and herein we are required, each one in his individual capacity, each

one inasmuch as he is the creature of God, and a member of Christ, to contribute to the glory of his Creator, the stability of his church, the purity of his religion, and the memory of Christ crucified.

146 80

CHAPTER V.

THE PRESENT FORM OF OBSERVANCE.

1 COR. XIV. 40.

“ Let all things be done DECENTLY AND IN ORDER.”

THE nature and design of the institution of the Lord's Supper, the history of its abuses, changes, and various methods of celebration, from the time of its original establishment up to the present day, have already been examined.

Our business is now to investigate the present form of celebration in the Church of England.

It appears from the New Testament, that our blessed Lord, in His original institution of the holy sacrament, did not lay down any specific form of prayer in which it should be observed, nor any specific place, nor any specific time. Hence, therefore, as far as the essential nature of the rite is concerned, no peculiar form is requisite, save, perhaps, the mention of the words of institution—*“ This is My Body,” “ This is My Blood,”*—and

the record of the circumstances under which they were used. But as a Church, agreeing in the propriety of a liturgy, agreeing in the decorum, sanctity, and general tenor of devotion, which is produced by an established form of prayer, rather than trust to the accidental effusion of extemporaneous excitement, which would vary according to the abilities of those who delivered it, we do but proceed in consistence with that general opinion, when we lay down for the Eucharist, as well as for every other part of divine service, a distinct form in which it may be celebrated. It might, perhaps, be said to matter not whether that form be, as in the Established Religion of Scotland, to receive the communion in a sitting posture, or as in our own Church, in a kneeling posture; whether it be used with *this* sort of wine, or *that* sort of wine; whether it should be celebrated in the morning or in the evening, fasting or not fasting. All these things might be said to matter not to the essence and virtue of the sacrament. But still we should require this great principle, as in all religious actions, so in the Holy Communion, that everything, according to the apostle's direction, should be done "*decently and in order.*"

Let us first say a few words on the *place* where this holy office is administered, and then direct our attention to the service itself.

The ancient churches were in general divided into two principal parts. The naos, or nave, and the bema, or chancel. The nave was the public and general place where the laity assembled for ordinary worship; the bema was so called because it was in general an ascent by steps from the body of the church, and being railed off by small banisters, cancelli, thence took the name of chancel. In this chancel, so partitioned off, as more peculiarly holy, stood the altar, or holy table, sometimes directly against the wall, sometimes a short distance from it. Whether, indeed, it should be called altar, or table, there has been much dispute. In the three first centuries it is called, more than twenty times, an altar; a table but once. In the reign of Edward VI, an order in council was issued to Bishop Ridley to pull down all altars, and to place tables in their stead; for at that peculiar time, when the nation was just emerging from the darkness of popery, and very great jealousies were entertained of anything that had the slightest semblance of the superstition of the mass, it was very natural that the name of altar should be looked upon with suspicion;* but now, as all

* Hooper, preaching before King Edward, says: "It would be well if it might please the magistrates to have the altars turned into tables, to take away the false persuasions of the people of sacrifices to be done upon altars, because as long as

misapprehension on this score is done away, and we have learnt to call the Eucharist a sacrifice, a *spiritual* sacrifice, as well as a sacrament, the name of altar may, without impropriety, be restored: and accordingly we now find this name promiscuously used with that of table. The material of which this altar or table was constructed was generally wood, sometimes stone: it was frequently ornamented with a canopy above it, sometimes with a dove, as representing the descent of the Holy Ghost, and at the time of celebrating the Eucharist was invariably covered with a clean linen cloth. That which covered the altar was called the *altar pall*, and another, which was prepared for covering the sacred elements, was called the *palla corporis*, or *corporal*, all which precisely accords with the customs of our present churches, and with the rubric, which directs the administration of the service.* “The table at the communion-time having a *fair white linen cloth* upon it, shall stand in the body of the

altars remain, the ignorant, both people and priests, will always dream of sacrifice.” For a more full account of these matters the reader must consult Mede, Bingham, and particularly “Johnson’s Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar Unveiled,” chap. ii. sect. iii.

This subject has already been referred to at page 163.

* That this is a very ancient practice, we learn from Optatus, A.D. 370: “What Christian is ignorant that the wood of the altar is covered with a linen cloth?”—Optat. in Don. lib. 6. And again: “You cleansed the palls or white cloths upon the altars to make them more holy.” Jerome also mentions it, A.D. 392. See Nicholls’ Comment on the Book of Common Prayer.

church, or in the *chancel*." And again, when the elements have been administered: "The minister shall return to the Lord's table, and reverently place upon it what remaineth of the consecrated elements, *covering the same with a fair linen cloth*." The chalices and flagons, and the cups for administering the wine, as well as the patens or plates for the bread, were originally, when the church was poor, of common materials, the plates of wicker work, the cups of wood, or any cheap material; but when the wealth of the church increased, these holy vessels were of gold or silver, as most suitable to the dignity of so holy a mystery.

Other ornaments of the altar, as in use in our present churches, there are not many, save only the two lights. These are peculiarly distinctive of the English Church; and not only sanctioned, but we may say commanded, by her rubric. It follows thus: The rubric at the beginning of the Prayer Book states that "such ornaments of the Church shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth." Any person reading this direction would refer as a matter of course to the time mentioned. So doing, he would find the following injunction:—"All deans, arch-

deacons, parsons, vicars, and other ecclesiastical persons shall suffer henceforth, no torches, nor candles, tapers, or images of wax, to be set before any image or picture, *but only two lights upon the high altar*, before the sacrament, which for the signification that Christ is the only true light of the world, they shall suffer still to remain." Now *before* the time of Edward the Sixth, there were, as the injunction hints, *many* lights—which *many* lights, the Roman church still uses; so that the use of two lights becomes at once a point of difference between ourselves and Rome. Any one entering our cathedrals, our college chapels, the chapels of our archbishops or bishops, and now, many of our parish churches, and beholding two lights upon the altar, would know at once where he was,—not in a dissenter's conventicle, for they neither recognise altars, nor lights at all; nor in a Romish conventicle, for they, imitating their church abroad, have introduced their many lights again into this country. The use of two lights, then, together with a simple cross, instead of the crucifix (which is an image), is distinctive of the English Catholic Church, as *ornaments* of the holy altar.

In all these respects, the church being furnished and duly prepared, according to primitive usage, we may now turn to the service itself.

The service stands in our Common Prayer Book under the title of "*The Order of the administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion.*" At stated periods, the whole of this service is performed, and the Eucharist administered to the congregation: but even at those times when there is no actual administration of the sacrament, still a part of the service is required to be read on every Lord's-day—that portion detailing the moral law, the Nicene Creed, the gospel and epistle of the day, the sermon, and prayer for the church militant.

The purpose of this would seem to be, even where communicants cannot be found, to remind the people of the use of that altar* from which the moral law is given, and the value of that sacrament which is there celebrated;—the pledge of keeping that moral law on the part of man, and the token of pardon for its transgression, on the part of God. In the primitive church, as I have already said, it was the custom to administer the Lord's Supper every Lord's-day at least, if

* Here we cannot but advert to the exceedingly improper custom, which prevails in some country churches, of performing this portion of the communion service in the same position in the church as the ordinary morning prayers, in the reading desk, instead of at the altar. The attention of the congregation is thereby totally diverted from the meaning of the service, and a slovenly and indecent manner of performing one part of the office must necessarily beget a disinclination on the part of the congregation to participate in the remainder.

not every day, and this custom of ours of reading a portion of the communion service is of course a relic of that olden time. However, our business at present is, to consider the service as a whole, just as it is performed in our churches on those days when the holy sacrament is to be administered. The service as I have already said is entitled;—“*The Order of the administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion*,” and properly speaking, it should be considered as one integral and separate service—distinct in itself from the matins, the litany, and the even-song. There should not be a curtailment of it on the part of the congregation, by leaving it unfinished after the sermon; but it should be viewed as perfect in itself, commencing with the Lord’s Prayer, and terminating with the Blessing: neither on the other hand, ought it (correctly speaking,) to be added as an appendage to the matin’s service, thereby needlessly lengthening the Church services to the extinction of all devotion, and destruction of their true meaning. It should always be remembered, that the Communion service stands by itself,—is a service of itself, and *that* the very highest,—and any junction of it with others is a slovenly and idle custom, with which the degeneracy of modern ages is, with many other vicious usages, solely chargeable.

Now taking this view, the service will be divided into three leading portions:—I. The Pre-Communion. II. The Communion. III. The Post-Communion. And of these we shall treat in order:—

THE PRE-COMMUNION.

But the Pre-Communion will again be divided into that portion which belongs to a time *preceding* the actual day of celebration, and that portion which is performed on the very day.

That portion which belongs to a time *preceding* the actual day of celebration, is contained in two long addresses of the priest or minister, which occur in the Prayer Book, immediately after the prayer for the Church Militant. The rubric directs one or other of these addresses to be read on a *Sunday* before Holy Communion is to be administered. It is to be read as a preparation or warning to the parishioners. The first is more of a direction for duty in regard to *self-examination*, exhorting to *repentance* and *confession*; the second is more of an appeal to the *feelings*, that men should not refuse to partake of this Holy Sacrament, being so lovingly called and bidden by God Himself.

Now in this place we may speak of a very

prominent feature, brought before us in the first of these exhortations, and which, indeed, is so frequently neglected, and so little understood, in our present relaxed system of discipline,—I mean the duty of *self-examination*, *penitential discipline*, and *confession*, as set forth by our Church.

The rubric which stands first in the service for Holy Communion, is this:

“So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion, shall signify their names to the curate, at least some time the day before.”

Now this is a wise and good wish and direction of the Church, for many reasons. First, perhaps, in order that the curate may be able to provide the proper quantity of bread and wine; but principally that he may have the power at his discretion of admitting or rejecting those who may intend to come. It is quite clear that many persons may come very *unadvisedly* to the holy altar; many ignorant, many really in sin unrepented; many thoughtless; many fresh out of the world and its carnal and ungodly scenes of pleasure and vanity. Such, if they would mind this rubric, would be counselled by the curate, would be admonished, would be put in the right way, either of instruction or penitence, and so come (not then, but at some future time) with real benefit, instead of injury to their souls' health. It does appear,

indeed, that many come to the holy altar at the present day without sufficient preparation. We know of some who have been, late on the Saturday night, at scenes of common worldly festivity, —at public banquets, balls, theatres, and the like, —and these specially among the higher orders, amidst (not to say scenes of vice), but, to say the least, scenes of anything but that which is a suitable preparation for the awful mystery of the great Christian sacrifice. We know of those presuming to come to the holy altar in perfect indifference, to receive, as a matter of course, the Body and Blood of their holy, pure, and self-denying Saviour; and many a pang of fearfulness for their souls does it cost the Christian pastor.

Now, by referring to this rubric, which directs a personal application of the parishioner to his priest, before coming to the altar, it is not wished to throw impediments in his way, or to increase the difficulty which already exists in the unaccountable prejudices of men; but only to guard the way against the *thoughtless* and the *unwary*. Nor is it meant to imply that the *regular* and *constant* communicant is to make this personal application at *every* time he communicates. Far from it: it is only desired to illustrate by it the spirit and intention of our Church, to make a just and sufficient *preparation*. Consider the

following passage in the “warning;” then compare it with the rubric which was just cited :

“And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy communion, but with a full trust in God’s mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore, if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort and counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God’s Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God’s holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.”

The two passages exactly coincide. They seem to point out a way of communication between the pastor and his flock. They show the wish of the Church, that no great religious work, especially this, the greatest of all,—the receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ,—should for the first time be undertaken without a reference to the priest and the steward of the holy mysteries. And herein is displayed our Church’s usual wisdom and moderation. In the Church of Rome, previous to admission to the holy Eucharist, auricular confession is made an essential condition; and not only is it impossible for any person to approach

the altar without giving notice, or signifying his name to the clergy, but it is also imperatively required of him to go through, and repeat before the priest every item of his sins.

Now our Church says nothing of any confession of sins as a necessary condition of communicating; though by the tenor of her directions in this service, as also more particularly in the visitation of the sick, she points to it as advisable, and recommends it in *certain cases*. In doubtful or timid minds, or in cases where any consolation or comfort can be afforded to the difficulties of life, or in questions of conscience, as in the words above put into the mouth of her ministers, she *invites* it: "Let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and *open his grief*." She would not have a person rush hastily and unadvisedly to this awful communion with his God: she would not have him to do it of his own will or judgment: but signifying his intentions and desire, as a new member of the flock, would give him this opportunity of knowing and being known to the priest who presides over him in the Lord. It is but for our own spiritual advantage to put every check upon ourselves in this holy rite, with a view that, through it, a check may be placed on all the tendencies and liabilities of our infirm nature. It is well,

surely, in such a mystery to be wary, to be cautious, to weigh it well, to think, to pray, to examine ourselves; and, if in examining ourselves we cannot satisfy our troubled minds, then to seek the priest and *his* advice and ghostly counsel. It cannot be imagined that our Church, in anything which she says and does, is purposely hypocritical. If, then, the priest is directed to say, "If any by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me or some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word, he may receive the benefit of absolution," surely he is supposed to *mean* what he says. Confession in our Church is *something*, or the Prayer Book, in the most awful of the mysteries of the Church, is a piece of mere imposture. Absolution is *something*, or the ordination of a priest, and his duties, and the words with which he is directed to charge his flock, are mere idle tales and blasphemous deceits. Not that confession of sins to a priest is in our Church *compulsory*; not that it is a thing *necessary* for holy communion, if the communicant desires it not; but only this, *it is ready should he desire it*. It is a burden placed upon the priest,—an onerous and responsible burden. But when there are penitents,—how many in this

sinful country, men and women, utterly fallen from their baptismal purity, worn down with sin ; many who seek anxiously to be relieved of the dreadful weight which oppresses them, in the contemplation of the wrath of an avenging God and a day of judgment, possibly to them very near,—when such as these, looking into their own hearts, fly into despair and reckless self-abandonment, and, for want of a timely friend, become utter and final castaways, surely it is right of the Church, as well as her bounden duty, to step forward and say, according to her commission, “ We are ready to help you if you will come to us ; we are willing to receive your burden in the name of Christ, so that ye may not die but live.”*

Such is all that need now be said of the *preparation* which the Church desires the communicant to make, *previous to the day*. We now come to the service itself, which will embrace, in this division, the following points :

I. The Lord’s Prayer ; II. The Collect for Purity ; III. The Lesson from the Old Testament ; IV. The Prayer for the Queen ; V. The Collect for the Day, followed by the lessons from the New Testament in the Gospel and Epistle ; VI. The

* More will be said on this subject, in regard to the “ power of the keys,” when we come to the *Absolution*, in the next division of the service.

Creed; vii. The Instruction, or Sermon; viii. The Offertory; ix. The Prayer for the Church Universal.

The service ought, strictly speaking, to commence with a hymn. This hymn or anthem is called "*The Introit*," because during the time of its being sung the ministering priests make their entry within the most holy place. We must therefore remember that the psalm which is usually sung in our churches at this portion of the service, is not, as generally imagined, the conclusion of the litany, but the commencement of the communion. The most proper hymn which can be used for this purpose, is *The Sanctus*, taken from the words afterwards used in the service itself, "Holy, holy, holy Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory!—Glory be to thee, O Lord, Most High." But when this cannot be sung, any other appropriate Psalm of David may be substituted.

The Introit being sung, our rubric thus appoints

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

"*The priest standing at the north side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with the Collect following, the people kneeling.*"

To us generally, as well instructed Christians, nothing can be so appropriate as to begin the service which is to commemorate the Lord's

death, with the words which constitute the Lord's Prayer.

And next after the Lord's Prayer, we offer to God the

COLLECT FOR PURITY.

Because, as in the book of Exodus,* when the people were about to hear the words of the law, Moses sanctified them, and commanded them to *wash their clothes*, as an emblem of purity; so we, as Christians, supplicate of the Lord to make us pure in heart, and sincere in intention, before we listen to the precepts of His holy will, "lest," as says the apostle, "sin take occasion by the commandments to stir up an evil heart, because we had not known sin," except the commandments had been given, "I had not known lust, except the law had said, thou shalt not covet."† After this preparation,

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

are recited, the people praying at the end of each that God may incline their hearts to keep them,—
"Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law."

These ten commandments, as containing the moral law, are binding upon Christians as well as

* Exod. xix. 14.

† Rom. vii. 7.

Jews, and the use of them in the celebration of the Eucharist is, of course, very plain. At our first communion with God in baptism, we were originally pledged to keep those very commandments; and now that a second, or renewed covenant is to be made, what more appropriate than to recite them once more, for the refreshing of our memories, and the clearer understanding of God's will? At every communion of the Lord's Supper, we renew the vow and pledge of the first; and as we are about to make new engagements for the future, and to confess at the same time the violation of those engagements in the past, the Church prudently directs the minister now standing in the most holy place, *i. e.* the altar, to turn himself to the people, and from thence, like another Moses from Mount Sinai, to convey God's laws to them, by rehearsing, distinctly, all the ten commandments, by which, as in a glass, they may discover all their offences, and still kneeling, may, after every commandment, ask God's mercy for their past transgressions.*

After the solemn recitation of God's will, we betake ourselves more immediately to prayer. S. Paul directs, that the Church is to pray for all persons in authority. The king, as the head of the Church and nation, is the person to whom the

* Wheatley, Com. Pray. p. 272.

charge of a due observance of God's law is committed. In the primitive Church, according to this direction, they always offered a prayer for their rulers at the time of communion, because they considered that a supplication for public virtue, and national godliness, could not be more appropriately offered than at a time of mutual communion. We must, therefore, consider these prayers offered for the king, coming so immediately after the recitation of the moral law, as offered not so much for his personal welfare, as for the preservation of public virtue by his authority as chief magistrate, so that he may, in the words of the prayer, "study to preserve the people committed to his charge, in wealth, peace, and godliness."

We next proceed to the

COLLECT, GOSPEL, AND EPISTLE

of the day. The latter, being selections from the *New Testament*, follow very appropriately the commandments, which are selections from the *Old Testament*; and they are in exact accordance with the Jewish custom, at the Passover, of reading over that portion of their history which detailed their deliverance from Egypt. We read in the book of Exodus: "It shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? ye shall

say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel, when He smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses."* Here is the reason of the service. So we, in the epistle and gospel, set forth the reason of *our* passover. We read some portion of holy Scripture, for the sake of recording our great deliverance from the bondage of sin. At the epistle we are permitted to sit; but at the gospel we stand, as making our reverence for that portion of Scripture more especially alluding to the history or words of Jesus Himself. Before the gospel, we in general sing or say, "Glory be to thee, O Lord," or "Glory be to thee, O Lord, most High:" and in many churches, after the gospel, there is also said, "Thanks be to thee, O Lord."

Our next business is

THE CREED.

Having solemnly considered God's will, both in the former and the latter revelation; having "believed with our heart unto righteousness," we naturally "confess with our mouth unto salvation;" and just as in the law, our business was to renew our baptismal vow of obedience, so now again, as one branch of that vow was to "believe

* Exod. xii. 26.

all the articles of the Christian faith," it becomes appropriate that, before we be admitted to the privileges of the renewed covenant, we should declare openly, in the face of the Church, that we abide firm and unchanged in the professions originally made. So doing we shall go to God's altar with all those great and solemn doctrines of Christianity fresh in our minds, our souls intent on the nature of that Being, whom we adore as God the Father, through whom we pray as God the Son, and by whose aid and holy influence we are sanctified, God the Holy Ghost.*

Next to the Creed, when the notices of festival days or fasting days in the succeeding week have been given, the *Sermon*, or Instruction, succeeds; and next after the Sermon, not the retiring of any portion of the congregation, but

THE OFFERTORY.

Let us carefully read what is said in the Prayer-

* It is observed by Mede, that all the prayers in the sacramental service are addressed to God the Father, which accords with the decree of the third council of Carthage: "No one in his prayers should name the Father for the Son, or the Son for the Father; and when we stand at the altar, *all our addresses must be made to the Father.*" "The reason is, that the Father is properly the object to whom, the Son, *by whom*, we pray in this mystical service; and, therefore, to direct our prayers and thanksgivings to the Son, would pervert the order of the mystery, which is an oblation of prayer and praise to God the Father, through the intercession of Jesus Christ, represented in the symbols of bread and wine."—Mede *on the Christian Sacrifice*, sect. iii.

Book, after the Sermon,—“*Then shall the priest return to the Lord’s table, and begin the Offertory.*” It is not said that he is to give the blessing, or say any prayer; but he is to *return to the Lord’s table*. This is the *priest’s* duty. But what is the *people’s* duty? It is not said that any are to leave the church (of course they ought not without a blessing); but it is said that they are to give alms, while the deacons and churchwardens collect it at their hands.

How beautiful, how edifying, how useful would it be, if our Church could but be heard in this her direction of the people as to weekly almsgiving. The duty of alms-giving, in the abstract, is of course acknowledged by every Christian; and the origin of the exercise of this duty at the time of *communion* is no doubt from St. Paul: “Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him” (1 Cor. xvi. 2). In the second chapter, we have already seen passages from St. Justin Martyr and from St. Cyprian, who testify to the observance of the duty in their time; and it has so continued through all ages. What more simple? what more in harmony with the general tone of the whole service?

Having expressed in the Creed the principles of our Christian faith, we now exhort one another

to show forth that faith in actual works, because “faith, without works, is dead, being alone.” At the first commencement of the Christian Church, a community of goods was an essential doctrine. We read in the fourth chapter of the Acts, “Neither was there any among them that lacked, for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles’ feet, and distribution was made unto every man, according as he had need.” It is very probable that this collection of property was made during the celebration of the Lord’s Supper: a time when men’s hearts, knowing no inequality in point of spiritual communion, would know no inequality in point of worldly wealth. In after times, when the Church was more enlarged, and the principle of community of goods ceased to be entertained, we still find the collection of alms retaining its place in the celebration of the Eucharist; and because, in the persecuted and uncertain state of the Christians, the clergy and ministers of the word were in general without means of subsistence, save from the donations of charity, the alms so collected were used principally for their maintenance. Even in our own Church, we may see this principle maintained, from many of the sentences inserted in the offertory: “Who

goeth a warfare at any time of his own cost? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? (1 Cor. ix.) "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your worldly things?" (1 Cor. ix.) "Let him that is taught in the word, minister unto him that teacheth in all good things." (Gal. vi.) "Even so hath the Lord also ordained, that they who preach the gospel, should live of the gospel." (1 Cor. ix.)

The circumstances of our present Church are certainly of a different character from those under which the primitive teachers of Christianity, in the midst of persecution and personal danger, depended for daily subsistence on the contributions of their flocks, but not so different but that it might be advantageous to restore, in some degree, the reading of those sentences, and the appropriation of the gifts to such purposes as those sentences would seem to imply. If no such possibility had been contemplated, why should our Reformers, at the time the liturgy was constructed, have thought fit to retain them? Why should there be one word remaining in our beautiful forms of church service rendered ineffective by disuse?

The rubric says: "After the divine service

ended, the money given at the offertory shall be disposed of to *such pious and charitable uses* as the minister and churchwardens shall think fit." And certainly we must argue from this, that other pious uses are contemplated, besides the actual relief of the poor.

It is clear that the alms may be dedicated to any pious use which indirectly affects them ; such as the maintenance of schools or hospitals : and it would be exceedingly desirable if we could in any way restore even the original intention of the offertory, and set apart some portion of it for the maintenance of poor ministers, for the sending missionaries to foreign countries, for the provision even of more clergy in our own country, for the aged widows or orphan children of poor curates, and many other such uses as would strictly come under the term of the rubric, *pious* uses, as well as *charitable*. In that case, we could use the reading of those sentences with better effect ; and it would surely be a delightful consideration, both for the communicants and for the ministering clergy, to remember that these gifts would then, as partly set apart with Zacchæus for the poor, so partly would be set apart as the "milk of the flock," for them who "feed the flock." There are many expressions throughout the service that decidedly bear out this consideration, such as the

following: "Whilst these sentences are in reading, the deacons, churchwardens, or other fit persons appointed for that purpose, shall receive the alms for the poor, and *other devotions* of the people." Now, here it is plain that there is something besides the ordinary alms—" *other devotions*;" and it is plain that this collection of alms is distinct from the actual communion of bread and wine, for we see in the very next direction: "And *when there is a communion*, the priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient:" so that the alms may be collected without the communion, though the communion cannot be without the alms. Again, in another place: "And if any of the bread and wine remain unconsecrated, the curate shall have it *to his own use*." And again, it is said: "And yearly at Easter every parishioner shall reckon with the parson, vicar, or curate, or his or their deputy or deputies; and pay to them or him all ecclesiastical duties accustomedly due, then and at that time to be paid."

Now, all these rubrics inserted throughout the service, and the latter one, upon which the custom of Easter offerings to the priest unquestionably depends, convey the same meaning as above stated; that in some degree the offerings of the Eucharistic service, even now, as well as in pri-

mitive times, should look to those who serve at the altar, and to the general promotion of religion throughout the world.

We may as well notice here, that the gifts of the people consisted, in primitive times, not of money, but of those fruits of the earth which each man's situation in the world enabled him to offer; more particularly wine, grapes, corn, and bread. Out of this, the priest selected such a portion as he thought necessary for the elements of the sacrament, and the rest was set aside for those charitable purposes above-mentioned. We must attend to this, because it is now a careless and erroneous custom in many of our churches to place the bread and wine upon the Lord's table before the commencement of the service, and by hands of laymen, the clerk, or the churchwarden—whereas the whole intention and spiritual meaning of the oblation is this:—The people make an offering to God, and out of that offering a portion is selected by the minister to be laid upon the altar for the purpose of the sacrament. The priest, therefore, having received it from the people, should lay it upon the altar with his own hands, as sanctifying the gift in the sight both of God and of the congregation. For it should always be remembered, that the bread and wine consecrated for the sacrament, are the offerings

or oblations* of the people, and this precisely meets the expression in the prayer which follows; for no sooner are the alms collected, than the minister offers a prayer for the *acceptance* of the alms, and to the word alms he adds *oblations*. This is called

* Without an oblation there can be no sacrifice, there can be no prayer or thanksgiving, nor any of the parts which constitute the sacrificial nature of the covenant. Not only, therefore, is it necessary that the people should make the offering, but that the priest, *and he alone*, should present it *for them* to God. But it is the custom in most churches for the sacred elements to be placed on the altar *before the commencement of service*, and by this, the beauty and design of the whole ceremony is lost.

In the Greek Church, as we read in S. Chrysostom, there was always placed within the rails a side table, where the elements lay until the time of communion; and Nicholls says, upon this: "Though our Church has not ordered any particular prayer for this action of the priest (the offering of the gifts), he ought not to neglect the action itself, nor suffer it to be done by any other than himself. And since the rubric has not authorised the setting of a side table, the priest must be content either himself to go into the vestry to fetch the elements, or he must receive them at the hands of the deacon or clerk, and then place them on the table, for place them there he must, and no one else." And the rubric emphatically directs: "The priest shall *then* (after the collection of the alms) place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient." Here the *time* and the *person* are distinctly appointed. "Therefore, I cannot imagine," continues Nicholls, "how so bold an innovation has obtained, for the bread and wine to be placed on the Lord's table by churchwardens, clerks, sextons, or any beside the person whom the Church has obliged to do it."—Nicholls' Commentary. Book of Common Prayer.

Mede speaks in the like manner: "It were much to be wished that this were more solemnly done than is usual; namely, not until the time of administration, and by the hand of the minister, in the name and in the sight of the whole congregation, standing up and showing some sign of due and holy reverence."—Mede's Works, fol. p. 376.

THE PRAYER FOR THE CHURCH MILITANT.

Now, the expression *alms* will refer to the money collected for charitable purposes, while the word *oblations* will refer precisely to those offerings of bread and wine laid upon the altar, as God's "creatures" offered to Himself, from His people, through the hands of His priest; and which, when consecrated by prayer, are to represent and become to the faithful the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

Humbly and reverently then the priest, laying these holy gifts upon the altar, prays: he prays in one of the most ancient of all prayers—he prays in the most comprehensive spirit of charity, for the whole universal church here militant on earth—for kings and princes, for bishops and priests, for the people and the clergy, for the sick and sorrowing, accompanied, as the Church has ever accompanied her prayers, with praises and thanksgivings commemorating the dead in Christ.

And so, the offerings being made, the gifts consecrated to God, and the elements of the feast being ready, the first division of the service terminates; such persons as must of necessity retire now taking this opportunity. But none are required so to do, for ALL may remain as witnesses (except infidels and heretics), even though the

be not for that day communicants—*all* may remain; but whether they remain or retire, now terminates the preparatory portion of the service, or pre-communion.

THE COMMUNION.

We now proceed to the main division of the service: that, namely, which contains the actual celebration of the holy feast. But as it has unfortunately happened, by the neglect of our Church, that our people have been led to think the *Sermon* the termination of the pre-communion, and not the *Prayer for the Church Militant*, so perhaps it may be well, before we proceed, to examine a little farther the correctness of the notion here entertained, that the whole congregation should be present while the offertory, both of the alms and the holy elements, is being made.

Let us take a review of the language maintained throughout the service. It will easily be observed that hitherto we have been considering all present as a *congregation*. For instance, in the *Prayer for the Church Militant*, it cannot but be observed that we pray for the congregation—a promiscuous congregation—as in the words, “And to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, and especially to this *congregation* here present;”

but immediately afterwards the language is altered, and we hear no more of a congregation, but of communicants, as in the Rubric which occurs next before the Exhortation. "At the time of the celebration of the Communion, the *communicants* being conveniently placed for the receiving of the *holy Sacrament*;" and afterwards, "Then shall the priest say to them that come to receive the *holy Communion*;" and again, "Then shall this general confession be made in the name of all those that are *minded to receive the holy Communion*." So that "*Congregation*" being the term used *until* the Prayer for the Church Militant, and "*Communicants*," immediately after, it would seem that the distinction and separation of the communicants from the non-communicants begins at that special place; and even then is a separation more *within the Church*, than any contemplation of the non-communicants as retiring *out of the Church*. And thus the expression that occurs in the invitation, "*Draw near*," would have a specific meaning, the communicants then drawing near the holy altar, the non-communicants remaining in their places in the nave. And when we add to this consideration the great fact that in our Service there is no "*ite, missa est*," as in the ancient liturgies; when we consider that there is no contemplation of a

blessing after the sermon, or in any other place, if there be a communion, but that, as before observed, the priest is directed especially to return to the Lord's table ;—all this would make for us clear inferences in the following order ; in the first place, that the congregation should not depart after the sermon ; in the second place, that they may remain throughout the whole service ; and in the third place, that the actual celebration of the holy Communion begins after and not before the Prayer for the Church Militant ; and it is all confirmed by the direction in the after Rubrics, that in cases where there is *not* to be a communion, the Prayer for the Church Militant is always to be read.

Now for clearness, let us divide this portion of the service in the following manner :—

- I. THE PREPARATION ;—II. THE THANKSGIVING ;
—III. THE CELEBRATION.

I. The Preparation begins with an address in the same manner as we begin the Morning Prayer. The minister addresses the people, “ Dearly beloved in the Lord.” He states to them the general object in view ; shortly exhorts them even now as not too late, to abstain from coming, unless they have well examined themselves, and for this purpose he quotes to them a passage from S. Paul,

showing the guilt of those who come to the Lord's Supper unprepared, or with any levity of behaviour; and he beseeches them to judge themselves, that they be not judged of the Lord. How beautiful, how devotional, is the whole of this exhortation! One would think that no one could listen to it without those feelings of piety and penitence to which it speaks. It puts before us, concisely, the great object of the sacrament; namely, communion with the Saviour. It speaks of spiritually eating the flesh of Christ, and drinking His blood; it reminds us that we shall dwell in Christ, and Christ with us: and what heart can listen to such gracious assurances—assurances derived from the word of God—without deep remorse for every deviation from His pleasure, and fresh determination in the amendment of his life? What glorious hopes fill the soul of the aspiring penitent sinner! How joyful is this harbinger of salvation! He no longer stands alone in the world to baffle the temptations of his natural state. He is joined with Christ in holy fellowship. He is elevated by the Holy Spirit strengthening and refreshing his weakness. He stands in mental and spiritual communion with his God and Saviour Jesus Christ.

We now come to the

INVITATION.

The feast being ready, the guests solemnly warned, and the steward of the mysteries standing in his place, the voice is heard pronouncing, DRAW NEAR. “Ye that do truly and earnestly repent, *draw near*,” but not only in body, but in faith. A bodily approach will not avail. A mere acceding to the form will not purchase the grace of that sacrament, therefore, “draw near with faith, and take this holy sacrament to your comfort;” but before you do so, confess your unworthiness; before you draw near to partake of the pardon, lay bare the sinfulness of your hearts at the throne of grace; have no reserve, no excuses, no evasions before God, but strip and lay naked your soul in the presence of your Creator. And so we come to

THE CONFESSION,

—the public confession of sins, “We bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, we are heartily sorry for our misdoings, the remembrance of them is grievous to us, the burden of them is intolerable:” and as each individual repeats the words, he calls to mind his own personal deficiencies; all that he has said, done, and thought, contrary to God’s word since the period when he last partook of that holy rite. And thus prostrating himself in the presence of God, a confessed sinner, a

confessedly unworthy partaker of all God's gift yet a confident claimant for pardon in the merit of Jesus the Saviour, the Priest, in the name and by the authority of that Saviour, pronounces

THE ABSOLUTION.

And now pause for a moment to contemplate the scene. The Christian brethren—brethren in charity, brethren in faith, brethren in infirmity are kneeling before the altar. Their hearts are all open and undisguised. Their thoughts are all laid bare before their great Creator; each soul is pouring forth its secret words of prayer and intercession; each heart is anticipating in faith the reconciliation of God; all they ask is, forgiveness; all they hope is remission of the past: and then the minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, upon *His* promise, and upon *His* authority, pronounces the pardon that is asked, the pardon of every repentant sinner. “Almighty God have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all your sins, confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life.”

The doctrine of absolution tallies with the doctrine of confession. If there should be error in the one, we should expect to find error in the other. Accordingly, as the Church of Rome imposes grievous burdens upon her people by her

ed auricular confession, so she assumes unjust authority by her pretended absolution. The Church of England assumes what is called the power of the keys;" assuredly she does, because to her that power, in direct descent from the apostles, as well as to Rome, has been committed: At then the difference between us is, as to the definition of that power. The Council of Trent asserts, "If any shall say that the sacramental absolution of a priest is *not a judicial act*, but a mere ministration, declaring and pronouncing that the penitent's sins are forgiven, provided only he believes that he is absolved, or that the confession of a penitent is not necessary, that the priest may absolve him, let him be accursed."* Here then is the point of difference. The making absolution a *judicial act*, i. e. leaving it to the priest to judge and determine whether the sinner should be forgiven or no; which is no more than taking it *out of the hands of God*. We never dare to assume such a power; we pronounce it blasphemous; for, "no one can forgive sins but God alone." (Mark ii. 7.) But short of making it a *judicial act*; in making it a *declaratory act*; in making it the *channel* of the forgiveness of God, though not the forgiveness itself; in making it an efficacious and virtual seal of remission, by the power com-

* Concil. Trid. sess. xiv. canon ix.

mitted unto the Church ; in these points, we agree fully, and establish fully, the great and comforting doctrine of the "*power of the keys*." For thus speaks the Church in many places. First, in the exhortation to this very service (as observed before) the penitent is directed to go to the minister of God's word, and "open his grief, that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of *absolution*;" and, in our services we have no less than three different forms of doing this (and to which indeed, it would be a blessing if our people would but give greater attention). We have no less than three forms:—one in the daily prayer; one in the office of the visitation of the sick; and the third, in our present service. They are all virtually the same, though perhaps that in the visitation of the sick may appear the strongest; but they are all virtually the same, and rest upon "the power left to His Church by Jesus Christ, to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him."* This power is described in S. John xx. 23: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained;" and it is conveyed from the Apostles downwards to the priests of the present day, by the imposition of hands at ordination. For thus it is said: "Receive the Holy Ghost for

* Absolution. Visitation of the Sick.

the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.”* If there is any meaning in words—any value in ordination at all,—any thing short of blasphemous mockery in the whole appointment of God’s servants to preach the word and minister the sacraments; then there is something very significant in this—something which, to say the least of it, must not be lightly regarded. What comfort is there in this absolution, and for all classes! Are men desponding, here is hope. Are they liable to punishment, here is deliverance. Are they fearful of death, here is everlasting life. Are they “*as little children*,” now in the years of their youth, approaching God’s altar for the first time with hesitating steps, here is the voice of assurance; “Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not.” Are they as the “*thief upon the cross*,” up to a late period of life, sinners, and only now, in their old age, or in approaching death, venturing to draw near, here is the voice which permits of no despair: “To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Are they the “*prodigal son*,” returning to their Father, with distant longings and fearful anticipations, here is the welcome

* Service for the Ordering of Priests.

of the rejoicing father, the ring on the finger, and the fatted calf. Are they "*the Magdalen*," bathing the feet of Christ with their tears, and wiping them with the hair of their head, here is the same Saviour who loved and cherished, forgave and blessed. Are they the "*woman taken in adultery*," while all mankind are pointing with the finger of scorn, and yet each one, thinking of his own sins, retires and makes way, here is the voice of charity and of admonition, coupled with love: "Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more." To all does the Church thus speak, in this holy service, realising the voice of the living God: "I will forgive your iniquity, I will remember your sin no more."

Thus terminates the preparation. We now approach the thanksgiving. And first:

THE COMFORTABLE WORDS.

There is a decided change and break immediately after the absolution. Joy then takes the place of sorrow: repentance worketh its sure fruit and recompence. "Hear," continues the minister of Christ, "hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith unto all who truly turn unto Him: 'So God loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in Him should not perish, but have ever-

lasting life.” And then, all standing up, the sorrow that arose from confession of sins being lost in the sense of pardon promised in the absolution, there comes the invitation of the minister, “Lift up your hearts,” and the answer, “We lift them up unto the Lord.” “Let us give thanks unto our Lord God,” and the answer, “It is meet and right so to do.” Upon which the priest takes up the words of the people, and gives his PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING: “It is very meet and right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee:” upon which, in return, the people take up the words of the priest, and join with him, with uplifted voices, in

THE TRISAGIUM,

thrice holy—hymn of thanksgiving. Their hearts replenished, their faith confirmed, their consciences unburdened, they sing aloud “With angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name, evermore praising Thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to Thee, O Lord, most High.”

Hence the name of EUCHARIST, which means, giving of thanks: in exact imitation of our Saviour, Who before He took the bread, gave thanks,

and before he delivered the cup, gave thanks. In ancient times this thanksgiving contained a full enumeration of God's dealings with man. It recounted the glories of His creation, of His government of the Jewish people, of the sending of His only Son, the miracles, the crucifixion, and the resurrection of that only Son; but in after times this doxology was contracted into its present form for ordinary days; but on festivals and particular occasions, we enumerate more minutely those mercies with which the day is connected, such as on Christmas day, "Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only begotten Son, to be born at this time for us:" on Easter day, "But chiefly are we bound to praise Thee for the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord:" on Ascension day, "Through thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, who, after His most glorious resurrection, manifestly appeared to all His apostles, and in their sight ascended up into heaven to prepare a place for us:" on Whitsunday, "Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, according to whose most true promise the Holy Ghost came down, as at this time, from heaven, with a sudden great sound, as it had been a mighty wind, in the likeness of fiery tongues:" and upon the feast of Trinity, "Who art one God, one

Lord; not only one person, but three persons in one substance.”*

THE PRAYER OF ACCESS.

This Eucharistic hymn being concluded, as we are now approaching more closely the actual communion, the priest turns again to the altar, and offers up, in the name of the congregation, a solemn address to God. This is beautifully devised, because, as we had just been elevated to a somewhat enthusiastic exultation in the glories of our blessed Lord, we here allay our too-exuberant thoughts, and subdue them into a more gentle and composed demeanour, previous to our actual eating and drinking of the bread and wine. We are reminded once more of the real state of our case, our unworthiness to approach these glories, our

* The particular form of this thanksgiving has varied at different times and in different Churches; but all have invariably agreed in *some* form, as constituting one essential feature of the sacrament. The *Apostolical Constitutions* give a form of very great length, which can be seen in Bingham, book xv., extending to three folio pages; others are not so long. Bishop Cosins says: “Our Lord Himself, before He brake bread and distributed it, gave thanks, and the Church has thought fit to do the same. But because our Lord has not thought fit to prescribe any set form for this, but used one agreeable to the thing and the time; for this reason the Church, according as matters and occasions required, has adopted peculiar forms of prayer and thanksgiving; and thus, according to the diversity of festival days, in which different benefits are commemorated,—the nativity of our Lord, the resurrection, ascension, descent of the Holy Ghost, &c.—different forms of prayer have been composed, that thanks might be given to God for them.”

miserable demerits in all righteousness and holiness of life. “We do not presume to come to the table of the Lord trusting in our own righteousness, but only in God’s manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under God’s table.” And then immediately follows

THE CONSECRATION,

in which the priest, standing before God, with the bread and wine placed before him in decent order, invokes the Lord’s blessing on the sacred symbols of the body and blood of Christ. In the ancient form of consecration, many additional expressions were used, which are now omitted. The Holy Spirit was specially invoked to descend upon the bread and wine, and at the mention of blessing and sanctifying the elements, the sign of the cross was made in signification of the sacrifice which they typified. But this custom, savouring too much of the superstitions of the Roman church, was omitted in the reign of king Edward, principally owing to the scruples of Bucer, and the prayer was then expressed in the same words which we now employ.

In this prayer of consecration there is no idea of a change of the bread and wine into any other substance than that which we behold. There are

no whisperings or secret prayers, but the words are used audibly; and the bread and wine remain bread and wine in the sight of the people. The only difference is, that the bread being broken by the hands of the priest, the wine being taken in the cup in imitation of Jesus at the last supper, and the prayer being offered to God that He may accept these creatures, (those created things,) as peculiarly and sacramentally representing the body and blood of our Lord, they become from that moment consecrated symbols and types. They are to the communicants in faith the very body and blood of that sacrifice of which they desire to partake. They are holy and mystical, but no change in their substance can be for one instant admitted; nor can we allow that the words of the priest are of any further efficacy, than by his prayer invoking the blessing of God in consecration.

We may divide the prayer of consecration into two parts; the *Invocation* and the *Commemoration*.

THE INVOCATION.

All the Oriental liturgies contain a direct invocation of the Holy Spirit, this invocation being that the Holy Spirit may make the bread and wine, to the communicants, the Lord's body and blood. Thus, for instance, in the Liturgy of Alexandria,

it is thus, "Send thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts, make this bread the honoured body of thy Christ, and that which is in the cup, the honoured blood of thy Christ." In the Liturgy of Clement, it is thus, "Send down thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that He may make this bread the body of thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ, that they who partake thereof may be confirmed in godliness," &c. Thus also it was in our own Liturgy in the time of Edward VI. The words in his Liturgy being thus, "With thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts, that they may be unto us," &c. And in the Communion Service of the Scottish Church, it is thus to this very day, "Bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son."

But although in our own prayer, there is no express mention of the Spirit, still in effect and meaning it is the same. For what is it that we do? We pray to God in regard to the creatures before us—bread and wine—that in them we may become partakers of the body and blood of Christ. But how can this be, unless the Holy Spirit interfere so to make them? It is nothing but the vir-

tue of the sacramental power that can change common bread and wine, so as to make them to any certain number of persons the body and blood of Christ. We pray for the effect, passing over the means. So that, upon the whole, in this as upon all other points, our service but corresponds with all the ancient forms, and without broaching any of the superstitious changes imagined by the Roman Church, in the bread and wine becoming the *carnal* body and blood of Christ, we yet retain all that is primitive and catholic, in praying for that *sacramental* change, which can only be attributed to the power of the Holy Ghost,—mystical and unintelligible, yet, to the faithful credible.

And then the second part is

THE COMMEMORATION.

And this must be divided into two:—

I. THINGS SAID; AND II. THINGS DONE.

A commemoration of the things said and done by our Lord at the last supper we shall find to be universally the custom among Christians in the celebration of this holy rite. It is indeed attempted by the Church of Rome to rest in the words of *commemoration* the whole virtue of the consecration of the holy elements. One of their principal authors, Bellarmine, says, “The form of

the sacrament consists *only* in these words, ‘ This is my body, this is the cup of my blood.’ They are *alone* sufficient to consecrate the Eucharist, and all other parts of the liturgical action, whether lessons or prayers, are indeed useful preparations, but have no share in the consecration.” The object of this doctrine is obvious: to elevate the power of the priesthood. But, as before shown in the *invocation*, the early Church set very great importance on the prayer for God’s Holy Spirit to work the sacramental change, and though the repeating of the words of institution is necessary in imitation of Christ, still they are in themselves nothing without the power of God invoked by prayer.

But being universal, and highly instructive and edifying in the way they are put before us, let us now consider them.

I. *Things done*.—1. The priest takes the bread in his hand and breaks it.

2. The priest takes the cup into his hand and blesses it.

II. *Things said*.—These are obvious, the mere repetition of the words of Christ, which He pronounced at the paschal supper; in the bread, “Take eat, this is my body,” and in the cup, “This is my blood.” By adding “*Do this in remembrance of me,*” all notion of transubstantia-

tion must to a common understanding directly be removed. It was done, said Christ, by *Himself* for the remission of sins. It was to be done afterwards by *us* in remembrance of what He did. *We* of ourselves could not do the thing which He did—die for sin—but what He did we all could hold in remembrance. We could not accomplish and perform His death over again; but we could *shew forth his death*, and this we do in repeating His words and actions, and the Church will ever do it, “until He come.”

And thus we come to

THE DISTRIBUTION.

The bread and wine being consecrated in the presence of the congregation, the priest administers them, to himself first and to the clergy who may happen to be present, and then the people, drawing up around the altar, and humbly kneeling down, receive from the hands of God's minister, first the bread, and afterwards the wine; a short form of words is pronounced at each reception, and the communicant retires to meditate in private on that great sacrifice which he has just commemorated. In the Roman Catholic church the consecrated wafer is placed by the priest in the *mouth* of the communicant, the custom evidently arising from the notion of its

being the actual body of Christ, and therefore not to be touched by impure hands: but this is so entirely superstitious, that it was at once rejected by our reformers, and we now deliver the bread and the cup *into the hands* of each communicant.

That this was the ancient custom of the church we have abundant testimony. Eusebius, speaking of one who was receiving the Eucharist, says, "He stood at the table reaching out his hand to receive the sacred food:" and Ambrose says to Theodosius, "How will you stretch out those hands which are yet reeking with innocent blood? how will you with those hands receive the sacred body of our Lord?" But as this custom came in with transubstantiation, so also it ceased when that error ceased, and our present rubric wisely directs us to give it "to the people in order, *into their hands.*" The form of words also which is used at the delivery of the bread and wine has sustained some slight alteration; it was formerly merely thus: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ;" "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," to which the communicant said aloud, "Amen." Afterwards, in the time of Gregory, the following words were added, "preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life;" but in the time of Queen Elizabeth, this form appearing to favour the doctrine of the real presence, the words were added,

“ Take and eat this in *remembrance* that Christ died for you,” and “ Drink this in *remembrance* that Christ’s blood was shed for you,” and thus it now remains.

With regard to the various doctrines of transubstantiation,—communicating in both kinds,—of the wafer,—of the mass in an unknown tongue, also of solitary masses, where the priest communicates without the people—of all these doctrines we have spoken in the proper place.* Sufficient it is for us now to pronounce generally, that the simplicity, the openness, the freedom from all undue mystery, which is so conspicuous in the consecration and reception of the Eucharist, as administered by the English Church, seem to accord more closely than either the Roman or the Greek church with the original institution of our blessed Lord. We eat and drink the bread and wine, not as the carnal body and blood, but as the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace; we hope that the soul within shall be strengthened and refreshed by the spiritual communion which we have in the body broken, and the blood shed, even as outwardly our bodies are refreshed by the nourishment conveyed to them by the bread and wine. We kneel before the altar with hearts replenished and sustained by

* See chapters ii. and iii.

faith, that faith not superstitiously excited, or with any degree of fanciful enthusiasm, but reasonably enlivened and moved by the symbols thus placed before us of the sacrifice of the Son of God. We behold and taste the broken bread; it recalls to our memory that solemn and tremendous hour when the Lord of life, Christ Jesus, our Redeemer, was led by the hands of wicked men, and crucified, and slain; we behold Him represented to our imagination, scourged and maligned; we see the accusation written over, "The King of the Jews;" we behold His mother weeping at the cross; we hear the blaspheming Jews, "He saved others, Himself He cannot save." Then we behold and drink the poured-out wine; fresh and fresh scenes for contemplation pass before us; they recall to our memory the blood that was shed by Jesus Christ; we remember, "that without sprinkling of blood there is no remission of sins," and we remember that that sprinkling has been made. The spear cast by the heedless soldier; the blood and water issuing from the wound; the thirsting lips; the sponge and hyssop full of vinegar; all these are vividly before our imagination, while again we hear the blaspheming Jews, "Let alone, let us see whether Elias will come to save him." Yes, there stands, as recorded on the altar of the Almighty Father, the memory of His

dearly beloved Son ; there stands the suffering Lamb of God, hour after hour, enduring the cross, despising the shame. We follow him from place to place, from the scourge to the cross, from His passion to His death ; we hear the complaining words, “ Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani.” We weep with Him, we pray with Him, we watch Him, until, faint and weary, the spirit is resigned into the hands of its Creator, and the last solemn words of the expiring Son of God are heard, “ IT IS FINISHED.”

With all these awful thoughts, and yet with a joyful hope in the express annunciation of Jesus : “ Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day : ” with hearts full of sorrow at the dreadful price of the ransom that was needed, coupled with spiritual love for Him that paid the ransom ; full of joy, full of hope, full of the Holy Ghost, Who descends as we may not unreasonably hope, to complete the work begun, to sanctify, to strengthen, and to bless—we approach the holy feast—we taste, and see how gracious the Lord is—we do it in remembrance of Christ.

THE POST-COMMUNION.

The communicants having now duly received the holy mysteries, we commence the third division

of the service: and this of course is but short, consisting of

I. The Lord's Prayer. II. A Prayer of Thanksgiving. III. The Hymn, Gloria in Excelsis; and, IV. The Benediction.

And first, the Lord's Prayer. This comes with peculiar beauty so closely after the Lord's sacrifice, the *words* of the Lord, after His *works*.

Then succeeds

A PRAYER OF THANKS.

We confess to God our unworthiness to approach His altar, we ask of Him to give us countenance in the holy fellowship just exercised, and we use the words of S. Paul: "presenting our bodies a living sacrifice," even as Christ did—"a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service;" so that we may not go from the altar as though we had never been there, but may be "steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord" for the remainder of our lives, and more especially in *that* good work of remembering our Saviour, of renewing from time to time the covenant of the cross, thus made and established between the creature and the Creator.

Then comes the hymn,

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS,

“Glory be to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men,”—following the practice of our Lord Himself, as every one will remember:—“When they had sung an hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives.”* No voice can be silent in this glorifying of the Lord. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are all united in one praise, but principally we sing the Son—“The only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, Lamb of God, Son of the Father,” because it is His peculiar sacrifice in which we have just partaken. It is His peculiar love which we now commemorate. “We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for thy great glory.” What heart will not respond to these stirring words? Angels and archangels may sing in heaven, but we have here a more glorious theme for exultation, in being the redeemed of the Lord. They may sing: “Glory, and honour, and power, be unto the Lamb;” but we can sing: “*Salvation* belongeth to our God and unto the Lamb.” Their robes may be white, “the righteousness of saints”—but ours are washed in the blood of the Redeemer. We are made whiter than snow, a sure salvation, a glorious inheritance.

* Matt. xxvi. 30.

This hymn concluded, and the voices of the people once more silent; their consciences unburdened—their souls free—their hearts light and joyful—their pardon sealed—the Priest turns to them for the last time, and pronounces

• THE BENEDICTION,

—the solemn benediction of peace. Upon this, the congregation is dismissed from the house of God, and the service closes.

But, O reader, before thou departest, think well of what has been done, if thou hast done it! The Public Service closes, but thou hast a prayer to say, and somewhat more to do of thyself before thou departest from the House of God. And what?

As we are told “to keep our foot” when we go *into* the House of the Lord, so also ought we to keep it when we go *out*; therefore, while still on our knees, and the words of blessing but just pronounced, a silent and secret prayer to God will be acceptable in His sight. He that is holy, in proportion to his holiness will feel the pollution of sin,—as that colour which is fairest the easier shows a spot; therefore, being thus made holy now, it behoves us to guard that holiness with exceeding great jealousy; being partakers of the table of the Lord, it behoves us to take care lest

we afterwards be partakers of the table of devils, i. e. be partakers of the idolatrous and sinful tables of the world; being now in full communion with Christ, it behoves us to take care how we communicate with Belial, i. e. how we give way to the common habits and societies of the world; being now made inheritors of the kingdom of God by a fresh bond and pledge on the part of God, in the body and blood of His Son, and a fresh bond and pledge on our own part in the sacrifice we have offered, of vows, and prayers, and praises, it behoves us to consider, lest by any wilful infraction of the pledge, the inheritance be never turned into a possession; for, “It is impossible,” says S. Paul, “for those who are once enlightened, and *have tasted of the heavenly gift*, and are made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come—if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance.” (Hebrews vi. 6.)

Here, then, I am, saith the sincere yet fearful communicant. Here I kneel within the precincts of God’s very presence; but in a moment I shall be without these holy walls, and then will come wars and fightings again. *Peace* now rests upon me, as sent from God, but presently *wars*. Comfort and forgiveness now—presently, sin and temptation. A blessing now—presently, the curse of

the devil. But go forth I must, though I would linger here and be with God. Go forth I must, for Jesus Himself has said, that though we are not of the world, yet we must be in the world. When Christ prayed for us, He prayed not that we might be taken out of the world, but only from the evil.

Go forth then I must, but *before* I go,—still on my knees before the living God, now, even now, when Prayer must be more than usually acceptable to Him in the recorded sacrifice of His dear Son; and when my words must breathe more than usual devotion, being still sanctified by this new incorporation of myself in His mystical body—now, even now, will I lift up my voice and pray.

And so, having said your private prayer, rise up; and it would be a reverent practice (though this of course must be left to each one's private feelings) but it would seem to be a reverential practice, to wait until the priest has said *his* private prayer also. Then moreover so waiting we might see if any of the bread and wine remains; because the rubric directs the priest to call some of the communicants, and reverently to eat and drink what remains (it is a guard against reserving the bread and wine for any superstitious use). So then, having waited till all this is done, and said your prayer in secret, and consumed the re-

mainder of the holy feast, you DEPART. And so depart, “*in reverence and godly fear.*”

Thus has been shortly detailed the form of that holy ordinance which our Church (we cannot repeat it too often) considers *necessary to salvation*. We see the simplicity, the beauty, the holiness of the forms with which it is observed. We have gone through the various portions of the service—we have shown that there is no disguise, nothing superstitious, nothing hard to be understood, nothing set, as it were, to catch the unwary, to frighten the imaginations of the timid, or to load the consciences of the simple with any onerous burden too heavy to be borne, but a plain, simple, and devotional memorial of Him who was Himself the pattern of all simplicity and devotion. Here, in this service, is the opportunity for every grace the heart of man can desire. Do ye require moral obligations and purity of heart? It is given you in the commandments, and in the collect for purity, in the prayer where we desire to offer our souls and our bodies a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice. Do ye require works of charity and Christian fellowship? It is given you in the Scripture sentences and in the collection of alms for the Church, the aged, and the poor. Do ye require *faith* to be set forth? It is given you in the creed, specially enumerating each part of the Christian faith. Do ye

require *repentance*? and sorrow for sin? Its expression is given you in one of the most beautiful forms of confession that can possibly denote the burden of human guilt. Do ye require words of comfort, as willing that God should be represented in His character of mercy? It is given you in the absolution, pronounced on the authority of Jesus Himself; and it is given you also in the sentences which set forth Christ the propitiation and the atonement for the sins of the whole world. Do ye require devotion, and exultation, and glory? It is given you in the thanksgiving, the Eucharistic hymn, and afterwards the great doxology at the conclusion. Do ye require your Saviour to be put personally and conspicuously before you, the price of your redemption, and the justification of your souls? It is given you in a manner so solemn, yet so simple, so lively, yet so plain, in the emblematic elements of broken bread and poured out wine, consecrated by His own words of benediction, “This is my body,” and “This is my blood,” that, if your minds are but intent, if your hearts are but in earnest, your Saviour *will* stand almost visibly before you.

Here, then, you have all that religion can give. The world can have no part or parcel with you here. Ye have overcome the world. Vice and sensuality can leave no stain upon your soul here;

ye have washed them out in the blood of the Lamb. Pride, and riches, and ambition, cannot hold you captive here—ye are all made equal—as ye were equal in sin, equal in fellowship as partakers of human nature, so are ye equally inheritors of God's kingdom. There is nothing heard, nothing seen, nothing done in this holy feast of love and charity, but that which is purifying, exalting, and stimulating to such high degrees of glory and virtue, as are otherwise beyond the reach of human attainment. If there are any means of grace, they are here; any hope of salvation, it is here; any personal communion between God and His creatures, it is here. We know no one but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified—we behold nothing but the Lamb of God, His broken body, His poured-out blood,—we do nothing but prostrate ourselves before the throne of the Almighty, we say nothing, hear of nothing, think of nothing, but “GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST, AND ON EARTH PEACE, GOOD WILL TOWARDS MEN.”

CHAPTER VI.

ERRORS AND OBJECTIONS.

ST. LUKE, xiv. 18.

“I pray thee have me EXCUSED.”

THERE is no subject, however plainly laid down in Holy Scripture, that has entirely escaped the misinterpretation of man. We have on the one hand, the mystical enthusiast, to elevate and spiritualize every simple direction of practice; we have on the other hand the literal interpreter of the word of God, to level and bring down to his own limited capacity, the spiritual mysteries of the Most High. What wonder, then, that in the sacrament of the Eucharist, various objections, endless errors in opinion, numerous excuses and evasions, as to its utility, its necessity, the frequency of its reception, the degree of fitness requisite, and the sin of receiving it in an unworthy manner, should abound in the hearts as well as in

the mouths of men. To these erroneous opinions, by which so many of good intention, and, sometimes indeed, sincere lovers of the word of God, are deterred from presenting themselves at the altar; and through which so many, holding them forth upon pretence and with worldliness of motive, are glad to escape the solemn obligations of their religion,—we will now, with God's blessing, direct our attention.

1. The first and most conspicuous in the list, as well as the most prevalent in every rank of life, is this,—*the idea of absolute perfection being necessary in him who communicates*. This is so well put, in the words of a most pious Christian, as well as one of our best and most learned writers, Samuel Johnson, that I cannot do better than give it in his words:—

“Such exalted piety, such unshaken virtue, such an uniform ardour of divine affections, and such a constant practice of religious duties have been represented as so indispensably necessary to a worthy reception of this sacrament, as few men have been able to discover in those whom they most esteem for their purity of life: and which no man's conscience will perhaps suffer him to find in himself; and therefore those who know themselves not to have arrived at such elevated excellence, who struggle with passions which they

cannot wholly conquer, and bewail infirmities which yet they perceive to adhere to them, are frightened from an act of devotion of which they have been taught to believe that it is so scarcely to be performed worthily by an embodied spirit, that it requires the holiness of angels, and the uncontaminated raptures of paradise.”*

But it is evident, upon the first view of the question, that no service could be demanded of man, of which the requisite should be unattainable perfection ; and it stands against all assertions of Scripture, that any sin committed against God, (one only excepted, blasphemy against the Holy Ghost), should, without hope of recovery, incur condemnation : of these two propositions we may be perfectly certain, from the acknowledged attributes of Almighty God, from His justice, mercy, love of man, and above all, the sacrifice which He made for human redemption. If God were to require a service in which all the sinfulness of the human heart should be expected to be set aside, and yet know, as of course He must, that that sinfulness was so part and parcel of our nature as to be unavoidably inherent in every human being, His attribute of justice would be questionable. If He were to inflict punishment, without hope of pardon, upon every attempt at obedience, because

* Johnson's Sermons, Serm. xxii.

that attempt, though sincere, could not be successful, His attribute of mercy would be questionable. If He were to exact the performance of a ceremony typical of His extraordinary love of mankind, so extraordinary as to involve the death of God Himself incarnate, and yet should punish, when His creatures approached in humble endeavour to fulfil His directions, His attribute of love would be questionable;—the sacrifice which Jesus made upon the cross would be more than questionable—*useless*; and the command that He gives in Scripture to record that sacrifice, worse than a mockery, because it would be a mere aggravation of the wretchedness of man, which it professed to comfort, and an extension of his condemnation, which it professed to redeem. Hence, then, from our first and barest conception of what God is, that He should demand a state of sinless perfection in the performance of any duty, would be contrary to our expectation.

In our other dealings with God, we never dream of perfection; on the contrary, the whole sum of our communication with God arises from our *imperfection*. It is because we are imperfect that we approach Him in prayer. It is because we are sinful that we are baptised. It is because we are frail, weak, and impotent in the control and regulation of our passions, that we approach

Him in confession. It is because we are under a sense of His wrath, and the burden of our natural and daily sins, that we require and receive from the hands of His priests the promise of absolution, that we hear continually repeated in the holy Scriptures the assurance of pardon, and the help of the Spirit to prevent, to strengthen, and to guide. Extend the same feeling to that more solemn communication with God in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and you will see the same form for its acknowledgment, and the same vent for the holy aspirations of a sinful, yet contrite heart. In that sacrament there is the express *confession* of sinfulness, the express promise of *absolution*, and the outpouring of earnest *prayer* for help;—but wherefore all these, if the communicant is to be perfect? Wherefore the sacrament at all? Wherefore that of which it is the representative and recorder, the death of Jesus Christ the Son of God—but because of *sin*, not because of perfection? Wherefore do we need the memorial, in any shape, but that we are sinners, but that we grievously offend God night and day, but that we confess and allow, by our very presence at the altar, our utter and never-ceasing need of an atonement for that imperfection, some other to bear the burden of our sins, which would otherwise be intolerable; some

other by whose stripes we are healed, and upon whom our chastisements have been laid.*

Now, if you look to the form of service by which the Eucharist is celebrated, will you find there any intimation that *perfection* is demanded on the part of the communicant? We have minutely examined this service already,† and we must have seen that the whole tenor of the ritual is on the supposition of the most abject frailty, the daily liability to fall from righteousness, the necessity of renewed strength, to be sought at the hands of God, just because of continual weakness on the part of man.

In one of the prayers used in the service of the Eucharist, we find the following expressions: "We do not presume to come to this Thy table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righte-

* We are indeed told to "be perfect, even as our Father which is in heaven is perfect," Matt. v. 48: and S. Peter tells us: "But as He which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation. Because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy." 1 Peter i. 15, 16. And it is unquestionably the duty of every Christian to *strive* to attain this perfection—to *strive* to possess this holiness. As we struggle onwards through the difficulties of life, we may be nearer and nearer, but we shall never approach it *quite*. We may set down such and such points of excellence, as constituting perfection, but when we have attained those points, there are others beyond them which we never saw before; and the better we are, in comparison with other men, the worse we shall feel ourselves to be; even as the more we know, the more ignorant we find ourselves; for knowledge only teaches us how little we really know, and moral virtue only shows us (when directed by the gospel of Jesus Christ) how sinful we are. If we say that we are perfect, we say that we have no sin; but "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."

† See chap. v.

ousness.” Again: “We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy table.” Again, in another of the prayers: “Although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice.” Yet, notwithstanding all this confession and acknowledgment of imperfection—when the sacred elements have been received—we kneel down before God, and say, “We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries.” So that being *unworthy* to receive them, is not incompatible with receiving them *duly*. If we should wait till we are *worthy* to receive them, we should never receive them at all; if we should think ourselves or call ourselves *worthy* to receive them, that instant we should, in fact, be *unworthy*—because then, pride, self-satisfaction, and a host of sins, which exclude the doctrines peculiar to the sacrament, would take possession of our hearts, and Jesus Christ would be forgotten.

II. The second objection to which we may allude, arises from a misinterpretation of certain texts of Scripture.

The timid, though sincere Christian, desirous to please, yet afraid to offend, finds the word of God apparently arrayed against him. In the first place, he finds in the exhortation which is read by the minister, when warning is given of the

celebration of the Eucharist on the Sunday or Holy Day preceding, the following assertion: "Lest, after the taking of that holy sacrament the devil enter into you, as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both of the soul and body." Now, the passage here referred to, must be either Luke xxii. 3, or John xiii. 27. In the former of these passages, though Satan is described as entering into Judas, yet it is evidently antecedent altogether to the passover, and, therefore, to the institution of the Eucharist: in the latter, where S. John asks our Lord who it is that should betray Him, it is certainly said: "He it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it; and when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas Iscariot, and after the sop, Satan entered into him." But here also, the giving of the sop was in the *commencement* of the passover, and preceding the institution of the Lord's Supper; and therefore can involve in no way the conclusion, that Satan entered into the heart of Judas, because he had received the sacrament of the Eucharist at the hands of our Lord, being a sinner. Whether Judas did partake, with the eleven other apostles, of the bread and wine, is a very great question. There is nothing to show that he did: on the contrary, we may very well suppose that

after the delivery of the sop, he went out for the purpose of betraying Jesus to the chief priests, and was not present at the institution at all. But even if he were, what then? Satan had evidently entered into him *previously*, as mentioned by S. Luke. The intention to betray his divine Master had for some time existed in his breast; and, therefore, he must have received the bread and wine (if he did receive it) with the intention already formed, with malice, treachery, and avarice ranking in his heart, thus adding hypocrisy and fraud to the other vices of his character. The partaking of the sop, or the eating and drinking of the bread and wine, were not the *causes* of Satan entering into him. Satan was there already; and, therefore, referring to the passages above quoted in the exhortation, it is quite a mistaken view of the question, to fear lest any power over our souls should be permitted to Satan: far the contrary; if Satan be in our souls already, if we are of the world, full of carnal lusts and evil affections, how can we hope to expel them, unless by the grace of God? and how shall we obtain the grace of God, unless we use the means? and one of the means is the Eucharist. Rather ought we to consider the other exhortation, which tells us plainly, upon the authority of God's word: "Take ye good heed, lest ye, withdrawing yourselves

from this holy supper, provoke God's indignation against you."

But there is another passage of Scripture, still more a stumbling-block than the one just discussed. It is the well-known place in the first epistle to the Corinthians: "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord *unworthily*, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Which very words are incorporated into our liturgy, and made a part of the warning which is pronounced by the minister at the time of communion. The words are: "So is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily. For then we are guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's Body; we provoke Him to plague us with divers diseases, and sundry kinds of death." This, indeed, it must be confessed, is, in the highest degree, a serious admonition. We gather from it, that to eat and drink unworthily is a very grievous and horrible sin against God; of *that* there can be no question. But we must define what *is* eating and drinking unworthily, in the Scripture sense. It effectually excludes all levity, all purposed slight, all *wilful*

sin, all *hypocrisy* in our attendance at the altar; but it will be easily seen that it does not embrace any sin of inadvertence.

To elucidate this, we must proceed according to the only rule for examining a difficulty; we must interpret Scripture by Scripture. One solitary text standing by itself, unless we know the context, unless we know what has preceded, and the course of the argument, and the circumstances of the argument, is of no authority whatever: and if we look to this passage with this view, all objections will quickly disappear.

In primitive times, and by the custom of the apostles, there was attached to the celebration of the sacrament another feast or banquet, called the Agape, or feast of Charity, or Love-Feast. It is much disputed whether this agape, or love-feast, was celebrated *before* or *after* the actual celebration of the sacrament; but it matters not to the question before us. The origin of it was this:—The donations and offerings of the people containing much more than was absolutely required for the sacrament, and being made in kind, that is, in bread, wine, grapes, and the like, at the conclusion of the sacrament, when they had set apart that portion which was required for the clergy, of the remainder they made a common meal in the church; and as it was the rich who thus contri-

buted to feed the poor, it took the name of Agape.* Most likely, therefore, as we know that the ancient custom was to celebrate the Eucharist fasting, early in the morning, the donations of the rich would be reserved for some later portion of the day, when the poorer communicants might again assemble in the church; and this would accord with Pliny's account, who says that the Christians, binding themselves by a sacrament, afterwards met at a common meal, in which was nothing criminal. However, be this as it may, whether after or before, there undoubtedly was some feast or banquet, at which the rich, making contributions for the poor, joined them, in charity and love, as equally in need of the blessings of God, and equal inheritors of his kingdom. As long as this banquet was observed with quiet thankfulness and due propriety of conduct, of course there could be no objection to it; and connected as it was with the actual

* S. Chrysostom describing the Agape, speaks thus; "The first Christians had all things in common, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles; and when that ceased, as it did in the apostles' time, this came in its room. For though the rich did not make their substance common, yet upon certain days they made a common table, and when their service was ended, and they had all communicated in the holy mysteries, they all met at a common feast, the rich bringing provisions, and the poor, and those who had nothing, being invited, they all feasted in common together."—Chrys. Hom. in 1 Cor. And it appears, from various other passages, that not only was it customary to join the Agape to the Eucharist, but the Eucharist was never celebrated without the Agape. See Bingham, book xv.

Eucharist, it was a means of diffusing that Christian brotherly feeling which the gospel so constantly inculcates. But the Corinthians had perverted its original use as a religious feast, into a common and ordinary meal, had assembled together in the church to eat and drink, having no regard whatever to Christ's institution, and not considering it in any way as the memorial of His death.

At this feast, so celebrated, there had been many instances of actual drunkenness, and other excesses. Therefore the apostle, in writing to the Corinthians with the express purpose of correcting many erroneous opinions and practices which had crept into their church, among others, alludes to this. He says, "When ye come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What! have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the church of God?"* And then, after describing the manner in which Jesus instituted the Eucharist, in order to give them a clearer conception of what it really was, he concludes with the text in question: "For he that drinketh and eateth unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the

* 1 Cor. xi. 20-22.

Lord's body." Now it is evident that this bears reference, not to the generality of mankind, but to the *Corinthians only*; that the sort of unworthiness here described is that perversion of the holy sacrament, of which they had specifically been guilty. It is not the will of God that any should perish, but that all should repent and be saved. "It is not by one act of wickedness that infinite mercy will be kindled to everlasting anger, and the beneficent Father of the Universe for ever alienated from His creatures, but by a long course of crime, deliberately committed, against the convictions of conscience, and the admonitions of grace; by a life spent in guilt, and concluded without repentance. 'No drunkard, or extortioner,' says the apostle, 'shall inherit eternal life.' Yet shall no man be excluded from future happiness by a single instance, or even by long habits of intemperance, or extortion, because repentance and a new life may efface his crimes."* And the crime of unworthily receiving the Lord's Supper is not different from other crimes. Supposing that a man *should* come to the Lord's Supper unworthily, supposing that he should be guilty, a case extremely improbable, yet supposing it for a moment, that he should be guilty of the sin of partaking unworthily of the Lord's

* Johnson, Serm. xxii.

Supper, is there anything in Scripture to show (sin though it be) that it is unpardonable? Though the soul is by such an act of wickedness endangered, it is not necessarily destroyed, or irreversibly condemned. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, contributes indeed, by eating and drinking, to his own damnation, as he that engages in any fraudulent or criminal transaction, contributes in the same way to his own damnation. But he that abstains altogether, is sure to be committing a sin; and therefore he does not the more ensure himself from danger by abstaining, than by communicating. As no short fervour of piety, nor particular acts of beneficence, however exalted, can secure a man from the possibility of sinking into wickedness, so no neglect of devotion, nor commission of crime, can preclude the means of grace, or the hope of glory, provided those conditions are fulfilled which the gospel demands as necessary to pardon. He that has eaten and drunk unworthily, may still enter into salvation by repentance and amendment, as he that has eaten and drunk worthily, may, by negligence, or presumption, perish everlastingly.

But, independently of this, the sin of the Corinthians can hardly, in any case, be applied to us. Our method of celebrating the Lord's Supper precludes the possibility of such a violation of its

solemnity. Only let us "*discern the Lord's body*," remember what we are about, distinguish the bread and wine of which we there partake, from other bread and wine, impressing upon our minds a just idea of the sacred nature of the rite, that it is the sacrifice of Christ's death which we thereby commemorate, that it is the Body broken upon the cross, and the Blood poured forth for human sin, which are represented under the elements of bread and wine,—and with this discerning it is impossible that we then should fall into the sin of the Corinthians.*

III. The third erroneous opinion in regard to the Eucharist may be thus expressed: "It was an institution adapted for apostolic times. Christ's command was only to His immediate followers, and I do not consider that the obligation extends in any way to the present day." Now this is im-

* The reader should also notice, as strengthening the arguments above urged, that the word used by the apostle is *unworthily*, not *unworthy*. In no case can we be worthy to have communion in the blood of Jesus, but we all may avoid the sin of communicating in an unworthy manner. I am borne out in this view of the subject by Bishop Beveridge, who thus speaks of the passage in question: "He doth not say, 'he that being unworthy (for so all men are), but he that doeth it unworthily, in an unworthy, irreverent, or indecent manner, not becoming so holy an institution, shall receive damnation (or rather as the word signifies) judgment against himself.' And then, to shew what *kind* of unworthy receiving he here means, he adds, '*not discerning the Lord's body*;' that is, making no difference between that and common food, but eating the bread, and drinking the cup, after the same manner as they do their ordinary drink."—Beveridge's Church Catechism explained.

mediately refuted on two convincing grounds: first, common sense; secondly, Scripture. The Apostles, personally, had no such particular necessity for an institution to remember Christ's death. Would it be possible that a follower of Jesus Christ, within one generation after the dreadful death which was encountered on the cross for the sake of man, should forget that death? would the words of heavenly warning, the prophetic admonition, "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and Scribes, and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify Him, and the third day He shall rise again,"—would these words, and others of similar import, so solemnly delivered, and so shortly after fulfilled in the dying scene of Calvary, be likely to be forgotten? would the scourging of the officer, the spitting of the profane Jew, the mocking of the Scribes and Pharisees, the gall mingled with myrrh, the vinegar, the hyssop, the dying words, "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani," and the last out-pouring of the spirit, "It is finished:" these very circumstances all prophetically announced hundreds of years before, and fulfilled in their very presence; the sacrifice for sin wrought and perfected, the redemption of man achieved, the salvation of the faithful secured:

—Would, I say, these great and wonderful things need a memorial in the hearts of them who had been present, and were eye-witnesses of the things that were done, and who were gifted by the miraculous powers of the Holy Ghost to bear testimony of them to others? Surely no. But when year after year should roll away, and when the memory of a dying Saviour should grow faint as a tradition, and should be lost and perverted in the handing down from father to son, then would this holy Eucharist, on the same principle as the memory of the Jewish exode in the passover, be retained as a sure token of the truth of our Incarnate God, as a sure remembrance of Him who ransomed the world from a worse bondage than that of the Israelites, and wrought a far more glorious exode than that from Egypt. The memorial would be “for us and for our children for ever,” not for the Apostles, but it must *begin* with the Apostles, otherwise it could never be handed down securely to us; the first step in the transmission must be the most sure, in order that all the subsequent ones might rest upon unquestionable authority.

But, further, what saith the Scripture on this head? S. Paul declares the institution of the sacrament, first, generally. He declares it as of immediate and special revelation to himself. He

says ; “ For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat : this is My body which is broken for you ; this do in remembrance of Me.” After the same manner, also, He took the cup when He had supped, saying, “ This cup is the new testament in My blood ; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of Me.” Here, indeed, is a general annunciation, differing in no material manner from the words of the Evangelists : but then he adds this remarkable intimation : “ For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till he come :” marking out most distinctly, as distinctly as human words can mark out anything, that this memorial is to continue through all ages, and all time, until that day when the Lord shall come to judge the world in righteousness. And thus it is that we, to whom eighteen hundred years have passed since the death of our Redeemer, do now show forth His death, and we must continue to shew forth His death, we and our children afterwards, “ until He come ;” until, whether as quick, we shall go forth to meet Him in the air, or, as dead, shall stand before the seat of judgment, to await the recompence of our deeds done in the flesh.

Let Christians, therefore, remember, and dwell upon this remarkable fact—that through all the circumstances of the church, through persecutions, through fire and sword, through famine and death, as well as in prosperity, and earthly glory, and earthly dominion, this memorial has as yet continued: however it may have been perverted in one age; however it may have lost its original simplicity in another age; however the majority of mankind have, by their negligence or their wilfulness, omitted its performance in all ages—still have there ever been a faithful few to shew forth Christ's death.

We have often had occasion to censure the Romish custom of solitary masses, but this good may be allowed to belong to it—that it did, *in some way*, keep alive that remembrance which the rest of the world passed by. Though in the heap of rubbish that was thrown up indiscriminately on all hands, the true fire of religion was obscured and overwhelmed, still the spark, the vital spark, continued alive, which afterwards penetrated through all difficulties, and burst forth into a flame, which kindled full brightly. How know we but that the origin of solitary masses may be owing to the voluntary defection of the bulk of the laity to remember Christ's death, and not to the wilful perversion of the priests?—that year after year fewer

and fewer were found to communicate, and so the clergy were *compelled* to communicate by themselves? And how know we but that this may be the case again? that if every Christian says: "It is no business of *mine* more than others; there are plenty of communicants to be found without *me* : how know we but that the time may come again when the altar of Jesus may be prepared, and the banquet made ready, and the priest standing at his post, and yet no one be found to hear the ministration, or to record the sacrifice? O let us not be the first to fail now. Let us not, who boast to be of the children of the day, enlightened and instructed, in the nineteenth century of Christ's church, be the first to put a stop, or even make any let or hindrance, to the transmission of the memory of Christ's sacrifice; but let every one of us, every one, with no single or accidental exception whatever, but every one, reach forth his hand to transmit it to our children, and our children's children, for ever. Each individual is equally concerned, each individual is to his own family, his own domestic circle, his own children, the point on which this memorial depends. Let him fail not to contribute to "shew forth the Lord's death till He come."

iv. Let us now proceed to another erroneous opinion. Many think that after the sacrament

has been received, every sin committed is unpardoned; that if we should, by any temptations of the flesh, relapse into an accidental deviation from God's word, or an habitual course of sinfulness, no forgiveness can ever be obtained again. This may be entirely refuted, even as in the first case, by a reference to the attributes of God, His mercy, His justice, and His love. God, by his Son Jesus Christ, has commanded us to eat the outward elements of bread and wine in token of His sacrifice. By this sacrifice, upon repentance for the past, and faith for the future, and upon a sincere intention to lead a new life, we hope that our past sins may be forgiven, and we are assured that they are; but there is nothing implied in the mere *opus operatum*, as a defence against all future lapses. Means of grace it is—channel of conveyance of God's Holy Spirit it is—the way of safety, and the sure rock of refuge for the bruised and contrite spirit it is,—but there is nothing to signify that by its *mere reception* the soul of man is infallibly to be saved from future liabilities to errors, or future lapses from holiness of life. It is impossible but that we should sin repeatedly after its reception, whosoever we be, and yet we may come to the holy table as repeatedly, and every one of us do so. We believe, indeed, that by presenting ourselves constantly and regularly at the table of the Lord,

we may gradually improve, gradually grow more confirmed in our resistance against the temptations of our nature; and as we use the means of grace which God has vouchsafed, so trust that we shall have stronger hopes of glory; and though we know that we never, in this imperfect state of things, can be sinless, yet we may strive to “grow in grace,” we may be fed with the sincere milk of the word, as *babes*, at first, in order that we may be able to partake of the strong meat of *grown up men* afterwards; and so struggle, not as one that beateth the air, but as one contending for the mastery in a most arduous conflict, and for a most glorious prize, “the prize of our high calling in Christ Jesus.” This is, indeed, one of the great ends of the sacrament—one of the reasons of its needed *repetition*; not for its abandonment or disuse.

But there is a passage occurring in S. Matthew, which troubles such persons much: “When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places seeking rest and findeth none: then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out, and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; *and the last state of that man is worse*

*than the first."** So, they argue, when once I have made up my mind to receive this Holy Sacrament,—when once I have systematically planned an amendment of life, and earnestly looked upon the past in repentance,—when having thus cleansed the house, I shall have received the Sacrament,—and afterwards, my house being left empty, swept, and garnished, I shall relapse—why here I am expressly told that I shall be worse than I was before. Most undoubtedly, in this case, you would be worse than you were before. The more knowledge you have of your sinfulness, if you yet sin in spite of that knowledge, the more guilty you are. But does the mere act of receiving the Sacrament, the *opus operatum*, create that knowledge? Does not the knowledge precede the act; and is it not the very knowledge, the very feeling you have of sin and wretchedness, that leads you to think of the act? Most unquestionably. The process of the mind is this: I see a command of Him whom I acknowledge as my Saviour. I feel a sense of sinfulness and regret for past delinquencies. I wish to profit by that command. By that very sense, call it conscience, the working of the Holy Spirit, or what you may, your heart is as it were cleansed, and the evil spirit is gone. Under this state of things, if you *refuse* to receive the Sacrament, you are not

* Matt, xii. 43.

the more likely to be guiltless in case of future relapse. On the contrary, you will be tenfold more guilty ; because, seeing a means of help, you have rejected it ; knowing the grace of God, you have done despite to it : while all the while your evil spirit is hovering at the door, ready to come back at the first opportunity ; and that opportunity will surely be more ready to his hand, seeing you have rejected the admonition of the Lord, and refused His proffered mercy. When once convinced of sin, then is the moment in which you are in the case of the unclean spirit gone out ; and the only difference which would arise from your reception of the Sacrament would be, that in all probability your house would then be well defended, it would never *be* empty, swept, and garnished, the seven evil spirits would retire defeated and abashed, and you yourself would go on from strength to strength, the righteous servant of the Lord.

But let us not err on the other side of the question. Do not suppose that you may come to the altar with any *intention*, any secret reservation, to continue in your sins. God forbid. Unless you come with a stedfast determination, as far as in you lies, to relinquish all that is past ; unless you look to the future with an earnest hope of improvement ; unless you pray for the Spirit to help your determination, and to work in your heart

renovation of character ; at each several time you communicate, you will be but playing the hypocrite with God ; you will be but using His means of grace to His dishonour ; you will be but the whited sepulchre, full of dead men's bones ; you will literally be like Judas, who went and sat down at the same table with his Lord, *intending* all the while to betray Him ; and of course, if you go to the table of the Lord, *intending* to betray Him, intending to persevere in your sins, you must expect then, that like Judas, Satan* will enter into you, and dwell there. But the fact of your *involuntary* failing, your falling into sin *inadvertently*, is a totally distinct matter. If your heart is right with God at the time of communicating, all will be well. There is not a man alive—there never could be a man who has received the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, who has lived a day, nay, even an hour after its reception—but that has stood in need of fresh mediation on the part of Jesus, even for that hour. It is the constancy of our sins that renders the constancy of our communicating vitally necessary. It is because we are weak, that we must ask for a renewal of strength ; because we have been soiled

* The case of Judas has been already entered into under the second objection, "*difficulties from Scripture.*" The supposition above referred to, is the only possible supposition by which the parable can hold good.

by our renewed intercourse with the world, that we have need to come back to the altar for a fresh washing of our souls in the blood of the Lamb of God. It is because carnal things *must*, by our very construction, constitute a considerable portion of our lives, that we betake ourselves to the Body and Blood of Christ for a fresh enlivening of our souls by things spiritual. It is because our memories are weak, our good emotions transitory, our aspirations after the glory of God faint and imperfect, that we therefore need a fresh notification of the grace of God, fresh confidence in the sacrifice of the cross, fresh hope of ascending on high, together with our blessed Lord, into the mansions of eternal peace and glory.

v. Another error in our notion of the Lord's Supper is this—*The deferring its reception to a time of sickness, or to the bed of death.* This error in great part arises from the previous one, for if sin, after the reception of the Lord's Supper be unpardonable, and we all feel that a liability to sin cannot be escaped from; then, of course, it follows, that the later it is received the better; the nearer the extremity of life, the less chance of condemnation from God, for any omission of duty or commission of crime, that shall arise subsequently. Here, indeed, is a strange infatuation. An acknowledgement of its necessity, but an in-

definite postponement of it,—so indefinite, as from the accidents of life, to render its participation extremely contingent. By this rule, multitudes of men would never partake of it at all; because multitudes of men die suddenly, without any sickness whatever,—multitudes never have a death-bed; die by the sudden attacks of diseases which suffer no time for consideration, in the perils of water, in the perils of shipwreck, in the perils of war,—in short, there are a thousand chances, which every one must know, by which life is taken away without any note of preparation. “In the midst of life we are in death.” Besides,—is not the whole ceremony devised for a time of joy and thanksgiving;* not for a time of sorrow, or of approaching death?

* Here we may observe, that in all strictness, the celebration of the Eucharist on any days but those of joy; such as the Lord's Day, or the commemoration of the saints and martyrs, is not consistent with the meaning of the Sacrament. For instance, Good Friday, though by present custom a day universally set apart for the Eucharist, yet being a fast day, a day of deep humiliation and sorrow, is not in all respects suitable. And that our Church is of this opinion, and did not mean to authorize the celebration of the Sacrament on Good Friday, is evident, from there being no sentence in the Liturgy to mark that day. For all other days—Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday, and so on—there is an especial sentence, descriptive of the benefits derived from the day; but no notice is taken of Good Friday. In fact, the Eucharist being a *feast*, and Good Friday a *fast*, the two things do not harmonize. I am glad to say, that since the first edition of this work, the custom of communicating on Good Friday has very much ceased. In many churches where the Book of Common Prayer is obeyed, custom has now begun of administering Holy Communion on Maundy Thursday, the day of institution, instead of Good Friday.

Consider these expressions: "Therefore, with angels and archangels, and all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious name." And again: "Glory be to God on high, and in earth peace; good will towards men. We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty." Are these expressions which can, with any degree of the exuberant joy and boundless exultation which the words bespeak, be uttered in the solitary chamber of the sick and of the dying? God loves not, Jesus Christ requires not, the deferred, reluctant, effete, services of His communion in the hour of the last sigh and the expiring breath, when the sick man goes to God, because he has no one else to whom he can go; relinquishes the world, because the world relinquishes him; flatters himself that he hates sin, and would forsake iniquity, because the deadened feelings of his passions no longer move him, and the flesh is mortified under the hand of God, by the failure of bodily power; not by the change of mind, or any voluntary act of the will. Surely not. The sick or the dying must not trust to this. The table is spread, and the guests are invited as to a joyful banquet, and a feast of thanksgiving. They are asked to come, while they can make the sacrifice

of a contrite heart, accompanied with the prospect of a life about to be amended, about to be improved in the varied course of Christian warfare, growing in grace day by day. They are asked to come, while the ruddy freshness of youth is upon their cheeks, and the active strength of manhood still remains; when the sacrifice of the world, and the giving up of human objects of ambition, and human objects of love, is a sacrifice; and not when the grey hairs of old age, and the deadened feelings of bodily disease, prevent all other thoughts but those of religion, and would send them as a reluctant resort to Christian consolations. They are invited, not to the solitary and sad confinement of a narrow chamber, without the hallowed feelings of time and place, and circumstance—but to the temple of the living God. For them the altar is spread, in company with their fellows, and before the multitude who come to God's house to keep His holyday. There they kneel side by side, there they pray side by side—not the rich in his luxurious chamber, or the poor upon his scanty and miserable bed, but at the altar of the great God and Saviour Jesus Christ—poor and rich together—the beggar and the prince, for once but equal sinners: “the last first, and the first last.”

It is no doubt a great comfort, a great source

of peace to the dying man to receive, as the last office of the Church, the Communion of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. It is no doubt a great spiritual benefit—but I cannot conceive, where the benefit can be, unless the dying man has been constantly in the habit of receiving it *through life*—I cannot conceive, that the feelings of the dying can of a sudden be wrought up to that degree of faith, or of love, by this Sacrament, which he has steadily refused on all previous occasions, and now for the first time imagines that he desires. Consider what sort of time the time of death is. Is it likely that a man's faculties will be so clear, his sense of religion so accurate, his memory so faithful, that he will be able to review his past life without prejudice or fear? or is it not in the ordinary course of nature, that his body will be afflicted with much suffering, his attention distracted by a variety of worldly matters? He is not sure that death will approach so tardily, or that the minister of God may be at hand in the moment of urgency. He is not sure that death will wait for the thousand accidents which may delay the preparation of the outward forms. Surely the hazard, the folly, the presumption of the thing, is self-evident.

If any have had such thoughts of postponement, they will surely shake them off at once. They will

enrol themselves as Christ's soldiers in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as they were once enrolled by others in the Sacrament of Baptism, while they are strong and vigorous, and not give Him their service when they are old and decrepit, and fit for nothing else. They will remember His death, while that remembrance may be shewn by the fruits of holiness in life, and not by a superstitious alarm in the ambiguous expressions of their dying moments. Often and often is the minister of Christ called, in his holy office, to administer the Sacrament to the dying. His first question invariably is, "Have you partaken of this holy rite during life?" How almost invariably among the poor, the answer is in the negative; and if the subject be pursued so as to ascertain the cause of its previous neglect, coupled with the present desire to neglect it no longer, in almost every instance we find the reason such as just now stated. It is thought a charm, a panacea for all sins; a passport for the Christian into the kingdom of God. But there is no command of Christ, that anything done in the extremities of life shall act as a passport to heaven. It may be received by the dying without any benefit whatever; it may be received ignorantly, or it may be received without faith, and without penitence, and without due self-examination, in the natural hurry of such an

hour; and then it cannot be effectual; it is only the faithful who can receive it effectually; and the faithful are those who believe in Christ Jesus spiritually, who cannot think that any outward act will tend in any degree either to save or to condemn, to remit sins or to retain them, and that know and feel every day of their lives, as well as in the hour of death, that they have need to remember the atonement of their Saviour, and that they cannot afford to lose any one means of grace, by which the mediation between God and themselves shall be carried on through Jesus Christ their Redeemer.

VI. But there is another excuse still more difficult to contend with. *Want of time for a due preparation.* Most surely, a due preparation for so solemn an ordinance is the part of every sincere Christian. We must not come to the table of the Lord with worldly or carnal minds, with our hearts unrepenting, or uncharitable, or careless. It was precisely for this reason that S. Paul censured the Corinthians, in the passage before alluded to. They came without a due impression of the sacred nature of the feast. They did not “discern the Lord’s body.” And so at the present day, gladly agreeing with the Apostle, that it is necessary that they should discern the Lord’s body—but because they are of the world, and the

world cannot discern the Lord's body—therefore, they are excused. Is this a good argument? Yet it is an argument under which the worldly man, the man of pleasure, and the man of business, shelter themselves at this day. They cry, "I have no time to prepare." They fulfil, to the letter, the parable of the supper described by S. Luke. The invited guests all began to make excuse. The first said, "I have bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it, I pray thee have me excused. Another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them, I pray thee have me excused; and another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come." Now, in this parable, each man excuses himself on the ground of other duties to be performed. No one says, "I care not for your invitation. I see not why you should ask me. I do not consider myself bound to give any attention to your hospitality; but—I have other things to do, other duties to perform, which are incompatible with this. The ground you will allow must be tilled. The oxen which I have bought you will allow must be proved. The wife whom I have married must be attended to." Now apply this to the Lord's Supper. You say, "I cannot come, because my mind is so much occupied in the business of life, that I have no time to spare for preparation. I am a servant, and

must therefore do my duty to my master. I am a parent, and must therefore provide for my family. I am in a trade or profession which demands such close attention, that I have no opportunity for that meditation and prayer which I consider requisite for this holy ceremony." But just pursue this argument a little further. You cannot procure time for preparation for an ordinance of Jesus Christ, which you yet acknowledge to be necessary to salvation. Let it be granted that the world has great claims upon you. Are they *so* great as the claims which God has upon you? Let it be granted, that there are important duties which demand a considerable share of your attention. Are they *so* important that God shall be entirely shut out? Is this world so paramount, so all-important, so all-absorbing, that the next should entirely give way? Is it natural, or is it consistent with the spirit of Christ's teaching, that the soul should be lost, while the body is saved? Do but compare things temporal with things eternal. Do but look at the multitude of exhortations, warnings, and parables, which admonish you of this truth; the selling of the whole estate to buy the one field, the goodly pearl, the one thing needful; and then consider whether that attention to the world, that being cumbered about much serving, that buying of oxen, that marrying of

wives can be rationally excusable, or excusable in the sight of God, which sacrifices to the mammon of unrighteousness the praise and memory of Jesus Christ. You are placed by this excuse in a dilemma, from one of whose horns you cannot possibly escape. Either Jesus Christ and the gospel, and your own salvation, must be inferior in your estimation to the world, or else your holding to the world to such an extent as this, is sinful; and the consequence must immediately follow—that you must, however great your possessions may be, forsake all, and follow Jesus Christ.

But for another reason, the argument is not tenable. It is not tenable on the ground of example. The most laborious in this world's vocation, the most industrious, the most absorbed in the noblest, deepest, and most important of worldly pursuits, are yet constant communicants. We have the most eminent statesmen, the highest judges of the land, the deepest philosophers, the most industrious tradesmen and merchants, the most laborious physicians; we have examples in abundance of all these various grades of life, which at once answer the excuse that the labours of the world necessarily preclude attention to this Holy Sacrament. Better were it for you that a millstone were hanged about your neck, and you yourself thrown into the midst of the sea, than that

such labour should be used, such wealth heaped up, such honours accumulated, as to preclude the salvation of the soul. Better that the body should be clothed in rags of poverty, and that you should walk among the lowliest and most humble servants of the Lord, than that your soul should be dead to the memory of Jesus Christ, if that be the condition of your tenure of riches, of your ambition, or of your nobility; and, be assured, that if you have no time for preparation for the Holy Eucharist *now*, you will have no time for religion, in any shape, *by and by*; you will have no time eventually for going to church, for prayer, either public or private, no time for communing with your own heart, and being still, no time for reading the Scriptures, no time in any way for studying those holy things which concern the doctrines of salvation. You must come to this in the end. Therefore, let the Christian avoid this excuse above all others, lest, while he first harden his own heart by being overcharged with surfeiting and cares of this life, God Himself shall eventually harden it, even as He did the heart of Pharaoh, and cut him off irrevocably from the gifts of His mercy and His grace. “Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.”

VII. We now come to the last consideration on which any erroneous opinion can be formed, and that is, the frequency with which the Holy Table should be attended.

All other points being settled, all thoughts of unworthiness, all fears, and scruples, and desire to defer it to the hours of sickness and of death, being set aside, yet there remains the question: "How often? What number of times in the year shall I communicate?" and too frequently, the lax and lukewarm Christian contents himself with as few possible times as the nature of the thing seems to admit. At Christmas or at Easter, two or three times a year, is the sum total of the obligation.

We have already seen that in primitive times a *daily* communion was considered necessary: shortly after, a *weekly* communion. In times of persecution, the Sacrament was never omitted by the faithful. It was considered the *viaticum*, the subsistence of the Christian for his journey to heaven, which, in times of peril, he expected from day to day to be called upon to make. S. Cyprian says: "We daily receive the Eucharist." So also S. Augustin says: "To receive the Sacrament every day I neither praise nor reprove, but at least let them receive it every Lord's day." And S. Ambrose, more pointedly: "Receive every day that which may profit thee every day:

but he that is not disposed to receive it every day, is not fit to receive it every year.”—De Sacr. lib. v. c. 4, In the time of Epiphanius, it declined to three days in the week—Wednesdays, Fridays, and Sundays. The council of Trullo decreed, that they who passed three Sundays without the Eucharist should be excommunicated, and thus gradually decreasing, the council of Agatha deemed that it was necessary to be received three times in the year—Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide; and then Innocent III. gave a further indulgence, that once a year was sufficient. Our own church, while it distinctly recognizes a weekly communion, we may almost say, a daily communion, for the *clergy*, yet allows three times a year as all that is *compulsory* for the laity. One of the rubrics, at the end of the communion service, speaks thus: “And in cathedral and collegiate churches, and colleges, where there are many priests and deacons, they shall all receive the communion with the priest *every Sunday* AT THE LEAST, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.” Now, the expression, *at the least*, would almost imply the daily communion, but every Sunday is, at any rate, distinctly commanded. Another rubric says: “And note that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one.”

But shall Christians, who read, and hear the word of God, confine themselves to cold and compulsory rules, which give the extreme limit of necessary communion? God's benefits to us are not measured by the plummet and the line. Jesus Christ shed his life-blood for our redemption; there was no sparing and measuring, and calculating how *little* HE could do for our service. Then why should we measure, and calculate how *unfrequently* we may go to His Holy Table, instead of saying at once—"I will be always there. Whenever the table is spread, I will be a guest? For the sustenance of our bodies, do we not require daily food? do we not require the waste which is daily going on by the workings of nature, to be incessantly repaired by bodily nourishment? And shall we take less care of our souls? Shall they be left to perish,—shall the sins, negligences and ignorances, which are daily wasting our souls, not require as continual reparation by that spiritual food which Jesus Christ brought into the world?

But some will say that they do not come so frequently to communicate, lest by making the ordinance too common, its impression should be lost. But the same argument will apply to prayer, to the observance of divine worship, to every thing appertaining to religion, and surely it is but a poor argument to say that a deficiency in

any duty is a means of promoting its more perfect observance. But hear what our great divines say on this subject.

Bishop Beveridge speaks of weekly communion thus:—"Once a week is now thought too much. And I do not deny, but that they who can live a whole week together without sin, may not have so much need of receiving it so often. But where shall we find such a man? not among us, be sure. We all know that we sin in thought, word, or deed, every day in the week, if not every hour too."* Bishop Jeremy Taylor speaks thus: "Some religious persons have moved a question whether it be better to communicate often or seldom; some thinking it more reverence to those holy mysteries to come but seldom, while others say it is greater religion to come frequently. But I suppose this question does not differ much from a dispute, whether it is better to pray often or to pray seldom; for whatsoever is pretended against a frequent communion, may, in its proportion, object against a solemn prayer."† Again, he says, "It hath fared with this sacrament as with other actions of religion which have descended from flames to still fires, from fires to sparks, from

* Beveridge. Necessity and advantage of frequent communion.

† Taylor's Life of Christ. sect. xv. disc. xix.

sparks to embers, from embers to smoke, from smoke to nothing. And though the public declension of piety is such, that in this present conjuncture of things, it is impossible that men should be reduced to a daily communion, yet that they are to communicate frequently is so a duty, that as no excuse but impossibility can make the omission innocent, so the loss and consequent want is infinite and invaluable." But the question is, what *is* frequently. How many times in the course of the year will constitute the term frequently; what rule should be laid down to regulate our attendance? The Church has already laid down a rule, if we must needs have a rule; but the warm and devotional feelings of the true Christian will go far beyond this, which was given rather as the extreme of *necessary* attendance, than any suggestion as to propriety. Unless very urgent reasons prevail to the contrary, the Christian ought NEVER to turn his back upon the *Holy Table*. It is not a question whether three or four times, ten or twenty times, be sufficient. Can we do sufficient to please God? Can we do sufficient in *any* religious duty to please God? The same rule that S. Paul gives for prayer, the Christian should take to himself for the Eucharist: "Be instant" in the Eucharist. Remember the

Lord Jesus Christ “without ceasing.” The oftener you present yourself at the Altar, the more you will desire to come again : the oftener you hold communion with the Body and Blood of Christ, the less frequently will you hold communion with the world, and the things of the world ; and therefore let your rule be this :—Whenever I behold the Holy Table prepared, whenever I hear the joyful invitation given : “Come, for all things are now ready,” I will straightway go in search of my wedding garment, I will take my place at the feast, I will be found kneeling at the steps of the Altar, hungry for the bread of life, and thirsty for the well of living water.

Thus have I attempted to examine the principal objections and excuses which men outwardly urge to a constant communion in the supper of the Lord. I humbly hope that the errors in all these objections have been demonstrated according to the word of God. But the human mind is prolific beyond measure in contending against the Spirit. Various and infinite is it, in its fears, its anxieties, its evasions, its self-deception. And there may therefore be some little points treasured up still within the precincts of your bosom, which I have not lighted upon, and which you still hug with delight, as untouched by the observations which

have been made. But I beseech you cast them forth. Upon ignorance, or upon presumed knowledge above the word of God, and the Church of which you profess to be a member, rely not; but give up your opinions, and away with your excuses before that piercing sword of the Spirit, which shall, by your prayers, if ignorant, impart to you knowledge; if wise above the word of God, impart to you humility. But if you will hear, not an uncharitable, but an awful truth; out of all the excuses, the objections, and the reasons, by which men keep aloof from the Altar of the Eucharist, the only *true* objection that can be found, the only real and vital reason which can avail in any man's breast, as a monitor, to say, "You are not fit to approach the Lord's Table," is this, *a determination not to abandon sinful habits*. But what is that? What a heart must that be? What a soul must there be presented before the living God, when the conscience is just sufficiently awakened to say, "You are not fit to approach," but yet not sufficiently strong to say, "Make yourself fit, through the help of the Spirit, by abandoning your sins." If the young live in fornication and adultery, and wilfully live in it, of course they dare not approach. If the middle aged live in unjust pursuits of gain, and wilfully

determine to live in them, of course they dare not approach. If your life be a life of worldliness drunkenness and revelling, chambering and wantonness, and you intend to make no change in your character, then you have a valid objection : and not only should you not approach, but it would be the duty of God's minister to reject you, if you should.* If you bear ill will to your brother, or look upon any one with meditated purpose of revenge ; if envy, malice, or any uncharitableness should harbour in your thoughts, then again your duty would be to turn away from those holy precincts, where nought but love can

* The rubric at the head of the communion service directs the curate as follows :—

“ And if any of those be an open and notorious evil liver, or have done any wrong to his neighbours by word or deed, so that the congregation be thereby offended ; the curate, having knowledge thereof, shall call him and advertise him, that in any wise he presume not to come to the Lord's Table, until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended his former naughty life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which before were offended ; and that he hath recompensed the parties, to whom he hath done wrong ; or at least declare himself to be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.

“ The same order shall the curate use with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign ; not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord's Table, until he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for that he himself hath offended ; and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardness and malice, the minister in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the holy communion, and not him that is obstinate.”

enter, to be reconciled to your brother, if he have aught against you, or you against him, and then come and offer your gift.

But you will surely pause before you offer any of these objections. You would not make them *openly*—you *dare* not make them openly; but pause before you make them even to yourself. While you openly, and before the world, and before the God of your salvation are exclaiming, “I have no time,” or “I am not prepared,” or “I am not sufficiently acquainted with the mysteries of the ceremony,” or “I will postpone it till a better opportunity,” whichever it be of these, all or any, beware lest the real one which gnaws at the very vitals of your heart; the real and the secret one be whispering to your own conscience, “I am a deliberate sinner; I am going on the broad way of the world; I am at enmity with God, and that is the reason that I will not go.”

But my Christian brother in the Lord, suffer me to plead with you; suffer me again to recall you from the wandering of your thoughts, to bring you back with the Spirit of God to the true object of your life, to the noble business which stands before you ready to be done, to the high privileges which by this wilfulness you are in the act of forfeiting. God’s grace is wide-spreading; God’s mercy is great. As far as the

east is from the west, so far may He set away your sins. But there is a limit. There *must* be a limit: and that limit, you that wilfully remain in sin, *may one day pass*. I do not say that you have passed it as yet, or that you will pass it, if you should neglect even to the end of your life, this, and all the other ordinances of the Church; but this I say, that this limit *you may one day pass*. It remains with God. Are you content to leave it with God? Are you content to hope that His mercy will be unlimited to you, if your obedience and your love have so very closely-marked a limit towards Him? I trow not. If you object to this Sacrament, inasmuch as you feel that you should incur condemnation for your presumption to join in it, *because you live in sin*, be assured of this also, whether you be rich or poor, learned or ignorant—be assured of this also, that by living in sin with such a hardened and obstinate heart, you incur tenfold more condemnation. You are in a dilemma, out of which you can in no way escape. You present yourselves daily before God with a seared heart. You refuse the means of grace offered to you. You go on from sin to sin unadmonished, because you despise admonition; unstrengthened by any help, because you desire no help; unjustified from any source, whether from works, because they will

condemn you, or of faith, because you in reality believe not any of the admonitions of the Saviour Jesus Christ. Therefore you go on from sin to sin, each day more intimate with Satan, each day more alienate from God. You must go on in this course, for you cannot stand still; you must go on, until at length you will find yourself, at the great and terrible day of the Lord, in that outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Pause and consider your position,—ye that bear the name of Christ, but in His Body and His Blood, hold no communion. You are outwardly professors of the faith of Christ, but practically you are unbelievers. You cannot really believe that sin, unrepented of, and unatoned for, *does* place you in a state of condemnation. You may talk about it, and say the words of the Creed, which pledge you in *sounds* to the doctrine of remission of sins in Christ's Blood; but you cannot *really* believe what you say, if acknowledging that you are in sin, you seek not the means by which to gain your redemption. You may talk about it, and learn the Catechism of the Church, and say by rote the dogma of the Church, that there are "two Sacraments generally NECESSARY to SALVATION"; but it can mean nothing on your lips, when, day by

day, week by week, year by year, you cast your life in direct opposition to it; and are content to pass by the very means, which by your own lips you affirm to be essential to your well-being as a Christian, and without which your salvation is humanly speaking, and by your own confession, gone. Does a man voluntarily acknowledge danger, and voluntarily acknowledge a means for its avoidance, and then as voluntarily refuse to *use* the means? Is not this such a proceeding in common life as would justify a bystander in saying, "The man is beside himself"? and must it not follow in the things of religion, that it is such a proceeding as would justify us in drawing the conclusion—"The man does not believe what he says"? *Morally* you should enquire whether your life is according to God's law; but in *doctrine*, you should enquire whether you have any real faith in the teaching of the Redeemer. May God avert the doom of the impenitent, and the godless, the unbeliever and the hardened, from you who read these pages. May we, as rational yet humble Christians; though sinners, yet not hardened sinners; though ignorant, yet faithful; aware of our danger, yet rejoicing in hope; feeling our temptations, yet knowing our help; so fight the good fight of faith, as in the end to achieve our victory over sin and death. May we

above all, and to this object looking, ever from time to time present ourselves, our souls and bodies, our hearts and lives, and all we have and love, at the Holy Altar of the Lord, "a living sacrifice unto God," in His merits Who died, and in His sacrifice which we commemorate, redeemed and saved.—Amen.

Jan - 1806

CHAPTER VII.

MOTIVES.

LUKE xxii. 19.

This do in REMEMBRANCE OF ME.

IT would hardly seem necessary, when so much has already been said in regard to the design, history, and objections which men urge to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, to add any especial part on the motives which should induce to its observance; for when we detailed its design, we explained by the way its advantages; when we answered objections, we signified by the way the reasons for its constant observance.

But still there remains much unsaid, and though we may have to travel over the same ground, yet it may be trodden with a somewhat different foot. Fresh beauties may be drawn forth in the landscape, which were unseen before, and that which had failed to reach the heart in one shape, may have its influence in another. Therefore, I would now beg the reader's attention,

while I endeavour to set before him the principal motives which may conduce to the general observance of the Lord's Supper.

I. The first motive stands evidently on the very front of the question : *the command of Christ.*

What makes the decalogue of value? What makes it our duty to obey the commandments of the moral law! Upon what grounds is it imperative upon us to love God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves? *The will of God.* It is only because God has expressed His pleasure, for our advantage and for our salvation, that we should not bow down to idols, should not lie, steal, covet, or commit adultery, that these sins have become sins. The moral duties of life might indeed have been obligatory by the laws of mankind themselves, laws constituted by mankind for their own interest and temporal advantage; but in that case, their neglect would have been no more morally wrong towards God than any deviation from the forms and customs of honourable life is morally wrong towards God, although that deviation may be culpable in the sight of man. And so S. Paul distinctly says : "I had not known sin but by the law, for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the

commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence, for without the law sin was dead." This is obvious, for if we had never been commanded, we never could have broken the commandment.

For the same reason, again, if we are destitute of charity, destitute of faith, destitute of hope—if we are like the heathens or the Israelites of old, proud, stubborn, and stiff-necked, wherein does the sin of that depravity of character consist? Surely in the opposition which is presented therein to the teaching of Jesus Christ. For if Jesus Christ had not taught the graces of humility, faith, and charity, there had been no sin in their absence from our hearts. If we are Christians, we are bound to cherish in our hearts all those peculiarities of feeling which mark the Christian. If the poor man demands our alms in his distress, we are bound, under a Christian obligation, to give heed to his request. If we suffer injury, we are bound, under a Christian obligation, to make no retaliation. If we have, from inadvertence, or the hasty anger of the moment, done wrong to any one, we are bound, under a Christian obligation, to restore him fourfold. But wherefore? No law of nature tells us this. Quite the contrary. No law of man tells us this. For whatever the law of man may do with actions, he can have nothing to do

with thoughts. The only reason which can exist is, the teaching of the gospel and the command of Christ.

If, then, the moral obligations of the law, and the Christian graces of the gospel, rest for their authority on the word of God,—and that alone makes them imperative,—we have nothing to do but transfer the argument to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and the sin of its omission stands out with equal certainty. “*This do in remembrance of me,*” is as imperative, as much of Divine authority, as much without exception, as “Thou shalt not steal;” for the same God has expressed His will with regard to both: “*This do in remembrance of me.*” It is not;—you *may* do this in remembrance of me: there are certain occasions on which you may do it *if you please*, or omit it *if you please*,—certain frames of mind and temper which will incapacitate you, so that you shall be guiltless in its violation,—certain circumstances of life which will render its observance or its non-observance a matter of indifference,—but, “*This do.*” Now, if it were only a *suggestion* on the part of our Lord, it would be ground enough for the Christian to go upon. If Christ had said: “If it is agreeable to you, you may do this in remembrance of Me,” even then, where would be the Christian’s heart to refuse? But it is much

more: it is positive. It is placed side by side, in virtue though not in letter, with the decalogue. Would that it were so in men's minds; would that this law were inscribed on our church walls, in parallel honour with the law of Moses, so that when we behold the creed of the Christian, and the prayer of the Christian, we might also behold this duty of the Christian, to remember the Saviour of the world, according to His own most holy institution.*

But I will put this in another light. In the prayer which we daily offer up to the throne of grace, one of our petitions is, that "God's will be done in earth as it is in heaven." Now, if we are clear upon the point of Christ's institution of the Eucharist, *that* is a part of God's will. With what appearance, therefore, of consistency, with what face of common sincerity, can we offer up that petition to God, and yet neglect in deed any approximation to the fulfilment of that will? We pray that God's will may "be done in earth *as it is in heaven.*" Of course, it must be done in

* Bingham, in describing the ancient churches, informs us that it was the custom to ornament the walls with various texts of Scripture. "Another ornament, which served for use, as well as beauty, was their comely and pertinent inscriptions, many of which are preserved, and still to be read in ancient authors." And to this day, in many of the old churches, these inscriptions remain; and the text, "*This do in remembrance of me,*" is not unfrequent over the altar, accompanying the creed, Lord's prayer, and commandments.

heaven with absolute perfection, and that perfection is spiritual and bodily sanctity, a perpetually holy and obedient life. But how can we be generally holy and obedient, unless we are specifically so? How can we pretend to be anxious about the will of God in our general conduct, when in one particular, we are notoriously deficient; when His precept—"Do this in remembrance of Me," stares us in the face in one page of the gospel, and "Thy will be done in earth," stares us in the face in another page—yet we stand daily violating the one, and daily praying for the other? "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" This was the rebuke of Jesus himself; a rebuke to those who listened with their ears, and understood with their mind, and followed not in deed. Why, indeed, do we enter the house of God and lift up our voices in prayer and adoration, thereby acknowledging that we wish to be Christians—and yet do not the thing which Christ says? We call Him Lord, Lord; we go there to ask of Him those gracious gifts which He has promised in His gospel; we go there confessing our sins, imploring pardon, seeking for the redemption which was wrought by His blood, and yet will not do the simple thing by which that blood is typified, and brought visibly to our hearts. "He taught not as the scribes, but as

one having authority." The Jews acknowledged that; and yet persons who profess to be Christians reject that authority; they question and demur, but will not obey; they invent superstitious fears, and will not listen; they hear the suggestions of their own fancy, but not the word of God.

A contract entered upon between ourselves and God is no light matter. But a contract has been entered upon between every Christian and his God. By baptism he was pledged, among other things, "to keep God's holy will and commandments, and to walk in the same all the days of his life," and it is idle to say that he, being a child, was not cognizant of that pledge; he virtually acknowledges it every day of his life, inasmuch as he has never yet withdrawn it; but he has more solemnly acknowledged it by the specific rite of Confirmation. The Bishop laid his hands upon him, and invoked the Holy Spirit to sanctify and to bless. To the question asked: "Do ye here, in the presence of God and of this congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in your name at your Baptism, ratifying and confirming the same in your own person, and acknowledging yourself bound to believe, and *to do all those things which your godfathers and godmothers then undertook for you?*" To this, in the house of God, and before the assembled Church, he solemnly

replied, “*I do.*” Then he must, in all candour acknowledge, that in rejecting this ordinance of the Lord he breaks those pledges, and he must in consequence acknowledge that the blessing attached to those pledges he also forfeits. If he recognises and believes the revealed word of God, if he is assured that that revealed word bears the stamp of Divine authority, that the Scriptures are the faithful representations of God’s will to man, that Jesus Christ, the author of his salvation, is one with God and is God,—he cannot in any fairness deny that his duty to keep this pass-over of the Lord is as plainly laid down as any other duty, moral or religious, throughout the whole Bible; and therefore every argument by which he convinces himself against its necessity, every deception which he practises upon himself in order to escape from its obligation, he may just as well employ against any other law of God, and for the same reason may become a fornicator, an adulterer, a violator of the Sabbath, a covetous man, who is an idolator, or be in any other way a confessed sinner, as he may an habitual neglecter of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. This is a strong way of putting the case; but nevertheless it is the true way.

II. The next motive I would urge is *gratitude*. Set aside the command: if this command had never

been given : yet is there no honour due unto the Son of God, the Saviour of the world? Does He merit no tribute of respect? Does He claim no token of our gratitude?

In every nation and in every age, illustrious men have invariably, after death, obtained some token of remembrance from their country. In whatever way their celebrity has been obtained, as philosophers, statesmen, generals; we behold on all sides monuments to their honour. We cannot, for instance, walk through the streets of any great city, without beholding its public benefactors enrolled in the hearts of the people by some species of memorial; monuments, inscriptions, coins, pillars, medals, all are devices of gratitude to keep alive in men's hearts the memory of the illustrious dead. Only apply this same principle (if indeed the argument is reverent enough for our sacred purpose), only apply this same principle, and we should immediately, as followers of a Master so holy, disciples of a Teacher so pure, subjects of a King so powerful,—we should immediately ransack the world to find a spot for some monument for Him who did so much for man; we should not permit His memory to lie for ages unrecorded; we should vie one with another to inscribe some votive tablet to our Saviour and our Redeemer.

But we cannot compare things human with things divine. Produce the greatest and purest benefactor of the human race, and Jesus shall be more great. Produce the wisest law-giver that ever took upon himself to devise schemes of legislation, by which the turbulent passions of man should be restrained, and Jesus shall be more wise. Produce the most disinterested instance of a man devoting himself, his life, his reputation, his wealth, his dearest things on earth to the cause of his brethren, and it shall fall into nothing before the devoted sacrifice of God's anointed. The conquest that Christ made was over death. The good that Christ wrought was the eternal welfare of the human race. The laws that Christ propounded were the laws of the heart—laws that searched deeper, and had a wider ken than man had before imagined possible to survey—the spiritual and vital principles of faith, hope, charity; the very mind and principle of every action—and lastly, the sacrifice that Jesus made was the sacrifice of His own blood. “Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends.” He bore the burden of our sins. How sore the burden was, look to the garden of Gethsemane to appreciate, and hear the supplicatory words, “O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me; nevertheless, not as I will,

but as Thou wilt;" while His sweat was, in this bitter agony, like drops of blood falling to the ground. He became a lamb, spotless and pure, offered up on the altar of the cross, a ransom for the whole world. By Him was darkness turned into light, and misery into hope. By Him the clouds of heathen ignorance and barbarian superstition were chased away, and turned into the glorious effulgence of spiritual blessedness. By Him the bitter sting of death was extracted, and the victory of the grave wrested from Satan. The arrow of the evil one, that points but one certain way, to eternal condemnation, was parried and thrust aside by the shield which He brought down from heaven—the shield of faith. By the weapons with which He has armed us, that same shield of faith, together with the breastplate of righteousness, and the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, we have gone on from point to point, until we have gained, or *may* gain, the height of glory, sanctification, redemption, and salvation.

What coin, then, what medal, what monument shall we raise up to commemorate this great deliverer, conqueror, law-giver, and King? We must search for some suitable device; we must build up something that shall be imperishable, for gratitude's sake. We must do something which

shall hand down for ages to come the benefits which we acknowledge. We must record the gift in terms sufficiently comprehensive to embrace the whole world, because the gift was to the whole world; and sufficiently lasting to be unmoved by the passage of time, because the benefits conferred are only coeval with eternity. But we need not search long. He has Himself anticipated us. He has Himself devised a memorial. Not one built of stone and mortar. Not a temple to be raised by art and man's device; for "He dwelleth not in temples made with hands." Not one confined to this people or that people, as circumcision to the Jews, and the holy of holies to Jerusalem; because now, according to His own most gracious intimation, "The hour has come when He is no longer worshipped in Jerusalem, or in this mountain;" but "His line is gone out through all the earth, and His words to the end of the world." None of these. But one spiritual; comprehensible to all, suitable to every people; a thing to be done; not to be looked upon; to spring forth from each individual's heart, to be renewed as fast as it decays, unchangeable, imperishable. And what is this? The eating and drinking of bread and wine. The peculiarity of the memorial which Jesus desired His followers to establish, we may consider as a singular proof of Divine wisdom. Had He commanded any thing *to be built*, or any

thing *to be said*, it would have perished in the ruins of time, or have been lost in the traditions of mankind : for having been once established, succeeding generations would have had no care in its preservation ; and that which affected no one in *particular* would have found no personal interest to maintain it. But when He commanded something *to be done*, something which each human being was to do in his own person, singularly, and by himself, and yet in union with others ; he took the surest step to make it lasting. For until men perish, this cannot perish. As long as there is a remnant of faith left among men in the Redeemer's blood, and any one man says, " I do this, in remembrance of Christ," there continues the monument even unto the ends of the world.

We may observe also the peculiarity of the thing to be done. If anything difficult, anything requiring great skill, or peculiar to one nation more than another, it would not have been universally applicable ; but as long as the existence of a human being depends on the bodily powers, and the bodily powers are sustained by food—as long as eating and drinking are the inseparable accidents of human life—so long and so universal, and so easy of attainment, must be the memorial of the Saviour of the world. And this being the case,—the thing required being so easy and so simple, shall any one refuse to join ? Shall any

one, however high, or however humble, refuse to add his portion to this holy work? Shall any one hold back in the maintaining of this record of his dying Saviour? “No man hath greater love than this, that he lay down his life for his friends?” And who are His friends? He says Himself, “You are my friends, if ye do whatever I command you.” And for that love, for that friendship, that laying down of life, the price of our salvation, shall we sit listless and slumbering hearers of His word, and yet not doers; admiring and confessing, yet not following; surfeited with the world, lethargic in our devotion, cold in our gratitude—while there stands a monument open to universal approach, a public monument in which, in order to its completeness, the hand of every Christian must add its individual inscription, a public recording of his faith, his love, his hope engraven in the visible representations of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ?

But at the same time that we urge the performance of this act as a memorial, we must take good care that it be carried somewhat further than the mere external act. The memorial must be considered as one of the mind, not only of the body. It is the heart that prompts, the motive that induces, the spirit that is breathing in our souls, that alone can sanctify any act, or make it accept-

able to God. There can be no remembrance of Christ in the cold and worldly and temporal affections, which are our general guides and companions in earthly things; there can be no gratitude towards the Redeemer in the barren and fruitless tree of a lukewarm life. It is a knowledge of Christ, a hatred of the things He hates, a love of the things He loves, a following of the things He followed, by which our gratitude should be distinguished and witnessed. Out of ten lepers who were cleansed, one only returned to give thanks: and, to our shame be it spoken, out of every ten in the congregations which frequent our churches, there is hardly a greater proportion than one who is found at the Lord's table to give thanks. "So unkind we be, so oblivious we be, so proud beggars we be, that partly we care not for our own commodity, partly we know not our duty to God, and chiefly we will not confess all that we receive. Our lips praise Him, but our hearts dispraise Him; our tongues bless Him, but our life curseth Him; our words worship Him, but our works dishonour Him. O let us learn to give God here thanks aright; to agnize His exceeding graces, that they being shut up in the treasure-house of our heart, may in due time, in our life and conversation, appear to the glorifying of His holy name."* This,

* Homily on the Sacrament, part ii.

indeed, is the real gratitude that should accompany our steps to the altar of our Redeemer. Not the external obedience or the external memorial, which, however necessary as far as they go, yet are not in themselves sufficient, but the heart: and when once the heart is won, when once the soul, through the inspiring grace of the Spirit, soars above the cloudy vapours which hover around, and encompass this world; into the pure ethereal regions which are beyond—the faith of Christ, (not the uncertain extravagancies of enthusiasm, but the calm, placid, undeviating faith of the cross,) then “are we very members incorporate in the mystical body of Christ; then are we heirs, through hope, of His everlasting kingdom;—we are assured of God’s favour and goodness towards us,”—we know that we live, and move, and have our being in Him. Remembering the mercy, remembering the sacrifice, remembering the sins that made that sacrifice necessary, we pass on our earthly course surely and steadfastly; we traverse our perilous path as holy pilgrims with loins girded, and staves ready, “denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, living soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, we look for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

III. The motive which I would next urge is

this: *The extension and security of Christ's kingdom upon earth.*

Christ's kingdom upon earth is comprehended in His Church, and by His Church is meant the associated body of Christian men; all therefore who are Christians are of the Church of Christ. It is no matter of what country men may be, as long as they embrace and practise the tenets of the gospel, according to the practice and traditions of the Apostles, they are of the Church of Christ. They need not be of the legally established religion of any particular country, because, for three hundred years, the Christians were not acknowledged by any government, and yet they were the Church of Christ; on the contrary, many who profess themselves of the legally established religion, whose names are registered as baptized in due form in the books of the church, who attend, for custom's sake, the public worship of the country, and, in fact, by all outward forms "profess and call themselves Christians," many of these, (how many, who can tell!) though they are *visibly*, and externally, they are not in their hearts and in reality of the Church of Christ.* We would not narrow

* Our articles say that "the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached and the Sacraments duly administered." But this visible Church, according to Pearson (see Pearson on the Creed, Article ix.), "embraceth all the professors of the true faith of

the entrance into the kingdom of God: we would not ask, with a certain one who said unto Jesus: "Lord, are there few that be saved?" because we feel sure that the door will be opened to all that knock, and that they who seek faithfully will be certain to find. But every one with his eyes open must acknowledge that there are thousands who live among us, outward members of what is termed

Christ, and containeth in it, not only such as do truly believe, but those which are hypocrites and profane." Within the notion of the Church are comprehended both good and bad, being *both* externally called, and *both* professing the same faith, for the "kingdom of heaven is like unto a field in which wheat and tares both grow together until the harvest," like unto "a net cast into the sea, gathering of every kind," like unto "a marriage feast, in which some have the wedding garment, some not." So Bishop Beveridge says, "It is a congregation of such men as profess faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore is called the holy Catholic Church, not as if every person in it was really holy, really a saint, really a believer in Christ, for that the visible Church here upon earth is like a floor in which is both wheat and chaff," &c.—(Beveridge on Nineteenth Article.) But it is evident that in proportion as the wheat abounds above the chaff, as the good fish prevail over the bad, and the more wedding garments are seen at the wedding supper of the Lamb; even so is the glory of God advanced, and His kingdom increased: "We being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." As, therefore, the Israelites were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, and thereby appeared to be one people of God, so all believing persons, and all Churches congregated in the name of Christ, washed in the same laver of regeneration, eating of the same bread, and drinking of the same cup, are united in the same cognizance, and so known to the same Church." So says Bishop Pearson; and if this be the case, then it must follow, that they who *do not* eat of the same bread, they who *do not* drink of the same cup, though they be of the "hypocrites and profane," who are of the *visible* Church, yet they are not in heart and in deed of that invisible Church, which with saints, and angels, and archangels, make up the "kingdom of God."

the *established* church, who are so for a variety of reasons, beside and except the two of faith and practice; either because their fathers have been so before them, or because those classes of the community among whom they live are so, or because it suits their general notions of respectability and decorum, and it would be strange and anomalous if they did not as others did—and the like. Now these men, proceeding upon such principles as I have just described, or principles similar to these, cannot justly call themselves of the *real* Church of Christ, of the kingdom of Christ, of the flock of that Shepherd who was all love and spirituality, and a contemner of the world, and a setter at nought of every thing that had not the good of mankind and the glory of God as its end and its foundation; O no, so far from it, they are hindrances in the way of Christ's kingdom, they are stumbling-blocks to the weak brethren, even as the scribes and pharisees were, preventing others from entering in, and not entering in themselves,—the rock of offence, not the rock of security, to the Church of their Redeemer. Heartless, worldly, negligent, selfish; they cannot be called as one body with Him who was all disinterested love, and unimpeached purity. They are not one with Him who, whether He ate, or drank, or whatever He did, did all to the glory of God.

We ought to draw a distinction, for it is a very important one to us all, between the legally established form of worship in a country, and the Church. It is an *accident* whether the Church be the legally established form of worship. It is an *essential* that the Church be built upon the foundation of Jesus Christ and His apostles—contain their doctrines and hold their traditions. Thus it is an *accident* that the Church of England is legally established; for, by the same accident, the Church of Scotland is *not* established. That form of worship which is established in Scotland, inasmuch as it holds not the customs and traditions of the apostles in episcopal government, is not the Church. And so, by the same rule, Wesleyanism, or Anabaptism, or Romanism, might be established in England by the legislature, but that establishment would not constitute either of them the Church.

Suppose, for an instant, that the whole legal establishment of our church were to be dissolved, would the Church of Christ be dissolved? it would remain in the hearts of those faithful who had before embraced it in their doctrine, and embodied it in their practice, precisely as it had existed previously. The spiritual and vital principle of religion depends not on human law or on worldly restrictions, on parliaments of lords and commons, on legal enactments, or verbal formularies. These

things no doubt are wise and salutary institutions for the management and discipline of external things, but they have nothing to do with things internal, further than as instruments to convey them. The laws instituted by man are a help and adjunct, a means of promoting the religion of Christ; but they are not in themselves the religion of Christ. No articles can create faith in man, though he may subscribe them; no creed can establish as felt truths the doctrines of Jesus Christ, though it may recite them; no canons can produce obedience of the heart, though they may define and compel obedience of the hand and of the mouth. No registration of a baptismal name will give Christianity, though it may be an outward title. It is not only "except a man be born of *water*," (the external form), but "except a man be born of *water*, and of *the spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Into the outward body He must indeed enter, or else, whatever spirit a man might have, he would not be *of the body*; but with the body, he must have the spirit, or else, whatever body he might have, he would be lifeless. Except he be internally and vitally regenerate, unless he have "the spirit of Christ," unless he be actuated by such principles as are in accordance with Christ's precepts, and Christ's doctrines, he "*is not one of His.*"

Considering, then, the kingdom of God as I have just defined it, in its highest sense, it is evident, that whoever, by his example, in obedience to the commands of the Gospel, displays to the world his testimony of the value of the Redeemer's love—extends that kingdom of God, glorifies His name, and fulfils the great purpose of His creation; and it is evident that he who refuses to do this, he who would abstain from those ordinances which Jesus has commanded, throws a check, puts a restraint, confines and limits the spiritual glories of that kingdom which brought salvation to man. But many a man prays—at any rate he prays the *words*—"Thy kingdom come." In his own chamber, if he bows the knee in secret communing with God; in the church, if he bows the knee in joint society with the congregation of his fellow-creatures, his words are daily poured forth: "*Thy kingdom come.*" Yet, with what meaning? With what semblance of sincerity, if he be not alive, by his own example, to make known the glories of his Redeemer? to extend to others the knowledge which he himself possesses; to show that the Church which he professes to love, is a Church "built upon a rock, and that the gates of hell will not prevail against it?"

What, then, it may be asked, are we to do with these? Are we to cast them out, and say they are

not of the Church of Christ? No: not *altogether*; but we are to say that being only so by *name*, only so by *profession*, they are not really, and at heart, "*in the kingdom.*" They are swelling the numbers of the *legally established Church*, but not the *spiritually established kingdom of Christ*. In laws and documents, parchments and courts, they would count for members. In the presence of Christ, they would hear these words: "*I know you not.*"

But what has this to do with our present purpose? Why, thus much: seeing that it is an essential feature in the religion of Christ's kingdom to propagate and extend itself,—seeing that it is vital to the truth of the profession of His kingdom, not only to be joined to the body, but to *extend* the body, and that the extension and enlargement of the body is the essential proof of its truth,—he, therefore, who lives in this kingdom *nominally*, not *really*, is a mischief, hindrance, and destroyer of the kingdom;—and he is in the kingdom *nominally* not *really*, who refuses to be a *communicant*.

True, the progress of the gospel has been miraculous. We have seen it for eighteen centuries advancing from country to country, from people to people. We have seen, at the first, that "the number of the names were together about one hundred and twenty;" we have seen, a short time after, that "there were added unto the Church

about three thousand souls;" and then, shortly after, "many of them which heard the word believed, and the number of the men was about five thousand." And so going on from Judea to Samaria, from Samaria to the various countries of Africa and Asia, from Asia to Europe, Greece and Rome, Corinth and Athens, the shores of Gaul and of Spain; to us also has this "*kingdom*" come. To millions of souls after millions have the glad tidings been preached, according to the promise; and we hope and trust that not only as a humanly constituted Church, but as the Church of Christ above defined, there lives in many of our hearts the true and lively faith of Christ crucified. These things we have seen; yet many a country still remains ignorant of the way of salvation, many a people still barbarous and rude; and, not to speak of foreign nations, how many thousands throng our streets, who are kept back from the kingdom of God; going on from day to day in the most obdurate recklessness and disregard of things holy, without the virtues even of a heathen, still less of a Christian; without faith, without hope, without fear, without knowledge? How is it that we send missionaries to the remotest regions of the earth, and yet have multitudes of our own people still beyond the pale of Christianity?—that we profess and speak high-sounding words of our enlightenment

and civilization, and yet not only the internal spirit of Christ is wanting, but even the externals—churches, and bishops, and priests, whereby the word of God may be preached, and His Sacraments administered? And yet, notwithstanding, we pray the words, “*Thy kingdom come.*” How is it that we cannot walk through the streets of any large town without being shocked at the obscene language and degraded habits of hordes of living beings created to the glory of God, but turning that creation into blasphemy and sin? and yet we pray the words, “*Thy kingdom come*”? How is it that thousands and tens of thousands of children are begotten in the most abandoned vice, and bred in the most ruthless ignorance, wandering at large without school and without instruction, either civil or religious, and yet we pray the words, “*Thy kingdom come*”? How is it that, on the Lord’s day, the rich are found at the festive place of meeting, while the poor are found buying and selling, and getting gain; the house of God neglected, and the day of rest, the Sabbath of the Lord our God, polluted: and yet we pray the words, “*Thy kingdom come*”? Why, surely, this must be the reason—that we only pray the *words*, and not the *thought*; that we are only *nominal* churchmen, not *real*; that we who profess to be within the pale of the Christian Church do not think and act according

to our professions, and that we are therefore looked upon by those without the pale with suspicion and with distrust. Our servants, our tenants, our children, behold us as men professing the gospel, yet not obeying it; as talking about Christ's kingdom, yet not doing anything for its extension; as reading in the history of our Lord, among other things, a most especially marked command,—THE EUCHARIST,—and yet ever abstaining from it; as professing to be of the Church, yet ever keeping aloof from the closest tie, and surest bond, and sweetest intercourse by which the Church can draw us unto Christ.

You say, these things cannot be known; the ignorant and the vulgar do not heed them; the vicious and the profligate do not regard them. It is not true; they *do* regard them. The ignorant and the vulgar wonder; the vicious and the profligate rejoice. Is not the kingdom of God as "leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, until the whole was leavened"? Does not the spiritual character begin slowly, and grow gradually, imperceptibly? It ascends from a small beginning,—a seed sown in the earth, until it expands into blade, and ear, and fruit; and this ordinance being neglected, checks the seed; being observed, germinates the seed. It penetrates with its spiritual gifts into all portions

of our character, makes us speak, and think, and act, as though remembering Christ; makes us look upon men with charity, and God with love; influences all around us, soothes and tranquillizes the moments of anger, induces forgiveness of injuries, benevolence to the oppressed, courage against the oppressor, patience, meekness, forbearance.

Shall a man be of this character, and not be marked? Yes, men will look at him and say "This is a righteous man; behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile." They will watch him, they will follow him; and when they find him, week after week, at the altar of his Redeemer, they will know whence he has this wisdom. They will follow him not as professing, but as doing. They will imitate him, and hold sweet counsel with him; and, haply, with God's grace working in secret, they will be brought themselves, by his example, into the light of the glorious gospel of Christ.

Surely if our worship is sincere, if we are members of the church in heart, and not only in words, if our souls are joined together with our brethren, and with our God, in that holy bond of union which Christianity teaches as essential to salvation, then should we be lights and patterns to those who might be removed by accidental cir-

cumstances from the knowledge of God. Here, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, is the greatest strength and stability of our Church. He who feels an evangelical desire to exercise and perpetuate the blessings of Christ, cannot find a surer method than this. The communicant beholds the Church a compact body, in all the strength and energy which must be produced by the union of many in a great and good design. Without this, Christians are feeble, because they are solitary; without this, they are easily broken down, because they are destitute of mutual support; they stumble and fall, because they have no mutual example; but with it they look upon one another as members of the same great Head, as trusting in the same redemption, as bought by the same price. Those that have the knowledge induce the ignorant; they that have the high places induce those who are the lowly of the earth. The master persuades the servant, the servant the master; the husband the wife, the wife the husband; and hence are those practical never-ending blessings which must arise in every domestic and political relationship, from union in faith, and union in sentiment; and thus a firm and steady phalanx is arrayed against God's enemies; and the faith of Christ crucified becomes less and less a stumbling-block to the worldly, and its precepts more and

more observed by the weak and the unstable. It works throughout the general character of the community greater zeal towards God, and greater love towards man, until finally, the whole building, "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner-stone," and, "being fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple of the Lord."

It was this ordinance, the sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, that bound the primitive teachers of our religion in that unbroken chain of Christian fellowship by which they overcame the world. It was this ordinance, the meeting together day after day, in love, and peace, and charity, reminding each other of their high and spiritual calling, exhorting one another, by mutual encouragements of faith, and patience, and endurance—it was this ordinance that sent forth the martyrs to die for the proof of Christ's truth. It was this that bade the apostles lay down the world, and its glory, and its pleasures, for the cross of Jesus; which bade them meet at first in an upper room, a counted few, and then amid the rocks and caverns of the earth, in secret, as persecuted and forlorn, and yet not forlorn, for God was with them. Here would they meet to break bread. No Lord's day found them without this holy feast. No week passed by but their faith

and their courage were stimulated by this remembrance of their divine Master, until the gospel was made known to people after people, and they themselves, in the strength of this remembrance, were content to die.

And this it is which bids the Christian of the present day, if we would *continue* Christ's kingdom upon earth, and fulfil the prophecy that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against His church;" this it is that bids us constantly and faithfully to pledge ourselves, our souls, and bodies, as living sacrifices unto God: which bids us here be followers of His most holy life, "who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth;" so that being found with Him in that holy fellowship on earth, we may also be joined with Him in the eternal glories of His Father's kingdom.

iv. The last motive which I shall urge, and indeed, one of kindred character with that last-mentioned, will be this:—*Our own spiritual and personal welfare.*

We have been just considering the kingdom of God with reference to the rest of the world. We must also possess that kingdom in our own hearts, and it must in the same manner grow, enlarge, and extend itself, spiritually in our own lives, according to the saying, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, for behold, the kingdom of

God is *within you*.” Now when we remember what our hearts are, how surrounded with every sort of temptation and danger; how frail, uncertain, wandering from this to that; if we remember the extremely perishable state of our natural lives, as well as our spiritual lives; if we remember our bodily infirmities, our mental infirmities, the dangers which assault us from without, the temptations which assault us from within, we shall immediately confess, that in order to direct our course with any probability of safety, we stand in need of higher help than we can furnish of ourselves. And this help is the grace of the Holy Spirit. The blessings of the new covenant cannot be attained by those who neglect its conditions. The blessings of the new covenant peculiarly consist in the various gifts of the Spirit, preventing, co-operating, and comforting. These were blessings unknown to the old covenant. They were the distinct marks of the gospel, and the result and consequence of the teaching of the Saviour. “It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart, I will send Him unto you.” It was not until the gospel came, not until Jesus Christ came into the world, that we were at all acquainted with that help, and comfort, and guidance which

the Spirit manifests. And so says bishop Jeremy Taylor, in his usual beautiful manner: “In the gospel the Spirit is given without measure, first poured forth upon our head, Christ Jesus, then descending upon the beard of Aaron, the father of our church, thence falling, like the tears of the balsam of Judea, upon the foot of the plant, upon the lowest of the people. And this is given to all that ask it, to all that can receive it, and by a solemn ceremony, and conveyed *by a Sacrament.*” In the first Sacrament indeed it is originally given, when, born “of the Spirit,” we first enter the ark of Christ’s church: but we have need of the other Sacrament to retain it; we have need of other opportunities to pray for it, if haply through sin we should once have let go the promise of our hope: we have need from time to time to be strengthened and renovated in the weakness of our flesh, to be comforted in our sorrows, to be sanctified in our afflictions. The Sacrament of the Eucharist is then one of the appointed means of obtaining this blessing. It is the condition laid down by God Himself, and we have no right to question the propriety of that condition, but implicitly to submit to it, and use it; we have no right to apply for that blessing in any other way than just that one which He has ordained. If we have temptations to encounter, we may hope that

the grace of God will work with us in those temptations. If we have infirmities of body, or sufferings of mind; if our spirits faint under the burden of the cross, we may hope that the Spirit of God will be at hand to sustain and to comfort. If we have sins to repent of; if we look back upon our past existence, and the review—pregnant with countless omissions, if not actual sins—presents to our mind a burden too grievous to be borne, we may here pray and trust that the merits of Christ, the atonement and propitiatory sacrifice which He made, may cleanse us from all sin, may cancel the penal bond under which, by violation of the law, we had inevitably been placed, and renew a right spirit within us, and so cause us to stand justified, accounted righteous for Jesus Christ His sake. Thus by every renewed communion we shall lose more of the old man and put on more of the new. Thus virtue upon virtue, strength upon strength, and grace upon grace, being stored up in the soul by an habitual recurrence to the only source of their provision, namely, the Spirit of God, furnished by means of His own appointed Eucharist; we shall pass through things temporal, dangerous as they are, and weak as we are, until we finally gain things eternal. By a constant communion with God, we must of necessity lessen any chance of communion with Belial.—The more we

are the servants of God, the less we must be servants of the world; the more we are one with God and Jesus Christ in love and fellowship, the more must our hearts be embued with those Christian graces which are the attributes even of the Deity Himself, "He dwelling in us, and we in Him."

It is obvious, that a holy life must be pleasing to God through Jesus Christ. It is obvious, that a due observance of the Eucharist *must* promote a holy life, for whatever our sins may have been, repentance is a necessary companion of that Sacrament; and repentance, renewed from time to time, must in the end produce its fruit. If, then, we pass through life in a state of sinful and unholy disregard of God; if we acknowledge a means of help, by which we may get rid of that sinfulness, and yet use it not; if the invitation to God's holy table be made to us year after year, and month after month, and yet, so invited, we refuse to go; can we wonder that our heart tastes not of the joys of heaven, that our weakness and wretchedness feels not any support, that in times of temptation we are abandoned to ourselves, and therefore fail; that in times of affliction we feel no comfort, and therefore are cast down beyond the remedy of man. What right have we to murmur, what cause to lament, what reason to suggest against the misery and vexation of spirit with

which as sinners we are overwhelmed, when God says, “ I will be to thee a Comforter,” and we say in return, “ I will not receive Thee;” and, above all, with what face shall we appear before the bar of our Almighty Judge at the great and terrible day of the Lord—with what face shall we plead any thing in justification, in excuse, in palliation, for our miserable failure in all obedience to our heavenly Father? with what face shall we say, as we shall perhaps attempt to say: “ My imperfect nature caused me to sin; I was willing, yet not able; I had no help in the hour of temptation; I had no succour when the evil one pressed me to disobey; I had no memorial of my duty, when I was urged by my natural passions to forget; I had no assurance when I was cast down by the overwhelming trials of the world.” Had you not? What, none? Was God so merciless as to leave you utterly alone? Worse than Lot, when he fled from the wicked city of Sodom, was there no mountain for you to flee unto? Like Esau, did you seek repentance even with tears, and yet find no place for it? Did David sin against the Lord, and stain his hands with murder and with adultery, and yet find a way, by bitter remorse and penitence, to cause the mighty God to say, “ I will put away thy sin, I will remember it no more!” and yet you, under the light of the gos-

pel, under the blessings of grace, with Jesus your Saviour—a Christian—were *you* yet left without mercy and without help? No; you will not dare to make such a defence. Jesus says, “I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without Me ye can do nothing.” Then whose fault is it that ye are without Him, if ye refuse to join and be with Him, when He asks you in His holy Eucharist? Again, “If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and withered, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.” Whose fault is it that ye are withered branches, dead boughs, lopt off the living trunk of the vine; that the sap and spirit of life rising from the trunk of the vine has failed to penetrate into *your* hearts, while all around are green and flourishing branches; not natural branches, but grafted branches, grafted on the stock of the vine, and therefore bringing forth fruit through the vine, full of fair promise, and a goodly vintage for the day when the Lord of the vineyard shall come to take account? Whose fault but your own; refusing communion with your God when it was ready at your hand? You rejected the bond that might have united you. The unction of the Holy Ghost could not anoint your worldly and carnal heart, because you placed your-

self in no situation where haply it might be found. The grace of God flowing from that holy fountain of love, which caused the Saviour to die for you, has met no seeking on your part. You have not been hungry after the bread of life, nor thirsty after the living water. The grace of God, as the return of penitence and of faith, as the answer to the aspiring heart of the Christian in communion with his Saviour, has not been shed forth, *because you have not sought it*. The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him, dwelleth not in you, because you have not wished it; because you have not cared for it.

This is the truth: "The grace of God is sufficient for us." We are told, in S. Paul's case, that it was sufficient for him; and though there may be a thorn in the flesh to buffet us; though the world may overcome us for a time; though we may have many lapses, many wanderings from the fold, yet, by a steady communion with Christ, there will be a certain periodical return, a closer intimacy, a firmer strength, a more perfect union in virtue and in glory, which must in the end prevail. We shall rise from our spiritual communion, "like a giant refreshed with wine;" we shall go forth each time more mightily endued with Christian weapons of resistance and defence;

and though we may be “ cast down, yet shall we not be destroyed ; though perplexed, yet not in despair ; though persecuted, yet not forsaken.”

Then, finally, let it be our rule to communicate as often as we may in the Holy Supper, with our God and Saviour. Only search for the means of grace in that way which the Lord God has appointed, and you will have the Holy Spirit the Comforter to dwell in you, and you in Him. “ It is the Spirit alone which comforts afflicted minds, which puts activeness into the wearied soul ; which inflames our cold desires and blows up sparks into live coals, and coals into flames, and flames into perpetual burnings ; and it is impossible that any man who believes and considers the great, the infinite, the unspeakable, the unimaginable and never-ceasing joys that are prepared for all the sons and daughters of the gospel, should not desire them ; and unless he be a fool, he cannot but use means to obtain them. For it is not directly in the nature of a man to neglect so great a good ; there must be something in his manners, some obliquity in his will, or madness in his intellects, or incapacity in his naturals, that must make him sleep such a reward away, or change it for the pleasure of a drunken fever, or the variety of a mistress, or the rage of a passion, or the unreasonableness of any sin. However, this promise

is the life of all our actions, and the Spirit that first taught it, is the life of our souls.”*

Knock, then, at the door, and it shall be opened; search, and you shall find; ask, and it shall be given you; ask in the Eucharistic feast of your blessed Redeemer:—and then, into your hearts, into your practice, into your every-day lives will the Spirit of God gradually descend, cleansing the foul, softening the hard, vivifying the dead. We shall gradually cast away the works of darkness, and put upon us the armour of light. We shall be strong, having put on the whole armour of Christ.” We shall pass through life in continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, in holiness pure, in our fears and temptations comforted, in all our weaknesses and imperfections strengthened; and when, at last, in the inscrutable decrees of Providence, the sand of our life shall run out, when the dark shadows of the night shall descend upon our souls, and the world shall fade away in the dimness of our mortal vision:—then the bright glory of Almighty God shall shine forth on high, and the voice of our expiring lips shall be heard as was the good and faithful Simeon: “Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word,” for my soul has remembered Thy sacrifice, “mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.”

* Bishop Jeremy Taylor.

Sept 1880

CHAPTER VIII.

REQUISITES.

1. COR. xi. 28.

“ But let a man examine himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.”

THE objections which men urge against the holy Sacrament, either from ignorance, or from sin, have been considered. The motives which holy Scripture, and the Church, and our religious feelings would dictate as *reasons* for its observance, have also been considered. But still there is something left. Let us suppose the case of a moderately well-informed person—one whose life is not either particularly holy, or particularly the reverse—one who lives in the world in the practice of his ordinary duties with decent regularity, and whose faith in the doctrines of the Church neither amounts to any great enthusiasm on the one hand, nor positive coldness on the other. Let us suppose this person *also* gifted with ordinary

reasoning power; acquainted with *history*, and the leading features of the Church of Christ; and beholding in the Church of *England* practices in the administration of the Holy Communion fully in accordance with the times of primitive purity—faithful and devotional. Let us suppose, then, on these grounds, that such a person were driven from all the *excuses*, *pretences*, and *prejudices*, in which he may accidentally, up to this moment, have been living; that, under the Holy Spirit, his heart may have been awakened to see something which before he had not seen; and that so he has a desire now at length, in reason and in spirit, to become a communicant. But then he will be immediately struck with the specific direction of St. Paul: “*Let a man examine himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.*” He will say, I am *convinced*: I see *the duty*: I acknowledge the error in which I have been. But then, on the other hand, how am I to be *prepared*? *What am I to do*? What is *required* of me, before I can venture to present myself at the Holy Table? Something must be required of me. To answer these questions will now be our object; setting before you, as the last branch of these lectures,—THE REQUISITES FOR HOLY COMMUNION.

The requisites are of two descriptions. First,

those which attach to the *Church*, generally, as a CHURCH; and those which attach to each *individual*, as a human soul responsible to God.

I. AS to the CHURCH. Inasmuch as all her ordinances are derived from the Jews, and the Church of Israel foreshadowed in every respect the Church of Christ, so also, in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, we find a very fit guide and precedent for our direction in the customs and laws appointed by God to Moses and Abraham, The passover, as before explained, was the type of the Lord's Supper; and in the account of the passover, as given in the book of Exodus, we find very explicit directions as to the qualifications necessary for that holy ordinance. It is thus directed: "And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover: there shall no stranger eat thereof: but every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. A foreigner and a hired servant shall not eat thereof. And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover of the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land, for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof."*

* Exod. xii. 43.

Here, then, we see that one essential point in the observance of the passover was circumcision. No *stranger* was permitted, in any case, to partake of it. What is the meaning of a “stranger”? One not circumcised; one not admitted into the Jewish Church by that ordinance which Jehovah had commanded, as the sign of the first covenant between Himself and the descendants of Abraham. Abraham was separated by God’s especial command from the nations of the world; his family was made a peculiar family of God; his posterity was promised to be numerous as the sand upon the sea-shore, and the blessings and privileges of the nation which was to descend from his loins were to be poured down in countless profusion. But the sign by which the promise on God’s part, and the obedience which Abraham pledged, on the other part, were ratified and confirmed, was circumcision. This rite of circumcision constituted the true Israelite; it was the mode of admission into God’s family, as we find detailed in the book of Genesis: “And I will establish my covenant between Me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee. This is My covenant, which ye shall keep between Me and thee, and

thy seed after thee—*every man child among you shall be circumcised.*”*

Accordingly, in pursuance of this covenant, we find God continually calling Himself, and directing the Israelites to call Him “their God,” the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,” “Jehovah God of Israel,” “The Holy One of Israel,” and so forth. While, at the same time, with reciprocal affection, He calls the Israelites His children, His peculiar people, His sons:” “Israel is my son, even my firstborn.”†

When, therefore, in after times, other circumstances arose in which God thought it right to interfere personally in the conduct of this His appointed family—that is to say in the deliverance from Egypt,—it was not inappropriate that another sign should be instituted commemorative of that second event. But none were to be admitted to the second covenant that were not members of the first. If not members of the first, they were strangers to God and not His own family; and it was perfectly just that those who refused to be of His family in the first instance, should not partake of those privileges and blessings which He had in store for them, in the second instance.

* Exod. iv. 22.

† Genesis xvii. 7.

Thus precisely the case stands with Christianity. As to the Jew circumcision was the initiatory rite by which he became a child of God, so Baptism is the initiatory rite by which the Gentile, excluded from God by natural and original sin, is washed and regenerate, and made the child of God ; and unless a man be so baptized,—whether Jew or Gentile,—unless he be so baptized, into the name of Jesus Christ, he cannot be entitled to the second ordinance of Christianity, the holy Eucharist.*

At the same time, we must not consider Baptism as a mere outward form. Even circumcision, in a religion which dealt much more extensively in forms than ours does, even circumcision was not a mere outward form; it *represented* something. It represented inward purity, casting

* “A person must be *admitted* into covenant first in order to *renew*, must be *initiated* in order to be *perfected*, must be *born* into Christian life before he takes in the *food* proper to support and increase it. There is an instance in antiquity as high as the third century, of a person who had long been a communicant, and who afterwards found reason to doubt whether he had been validly baptized, and scrupled the coming again to the Lord's table. His bishop advised him (considering how long he had been a communicant, and honestly all the time,) to go on without scruple, not presuming to give him baptism, which now seemed to be superseded by the long and frequent use of the other sacrament ; the case was very particular, and the resolution probably wise and just. Both the scruple on the one hand, and the determination on the other, show how acknowledged a principle it then was, that baptism is ordinarily a most essential part of the qualification required for receiving the holy communion.”—*Waterland's Review*, chap. xiii.

away the foulness of the flesh, and a dedication of the spiritual feelings to God. So in the epistle to the Romans we find: "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God ;"* and so we find in Jeremiah, "*uncircumcised in heart and ears ;*" and in Ezekiel, "*uncircumcised in heart and flesh.*" If so—much more in a Church whose very existence depends upon spiritual affections, and whose boast it is to have cast aside the burdens of the Jewish ceremonies, must we expect that the rite of Baptism should convey a far higher meaning than a mere outward form and watchword of admittance into the privileges of Christianity? Yet it is to be feared that many esteem it no higher: many make the holy Sacrament of Baptism but a mere worldly ceremony, bringing their children to the font for the sake of registering their names in the books of the Church, without any spiritual feelings whatever, and without any religious understanding of the obligations and solemn covenant thereby entered upon between God and man. In the case of adult Baptism, when it happens that the Sacrament

* Romans ii. 28.

is not administered until years of discretion, then indeed does the covenant so solemnly pledged, stand solely between the individual baptized and his Creator and Saviour. But where infants are baptized, whatever the understanding or the motive of the parent may be, we trust that the fault will not affect the child thus dedicated to God ; we trust that the prayer of the minister offered up in behalf of the unconscious infant, shall avail in the sight of a merciful God ; we trust that the child so received within the pale of the Church, is a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven ; and that they who shall thus be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, shall be capable of taking upon themselves, when they come to years of discretion, the ulterior pledges which are demanded by the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Infant Baptism is the general custom and doctrine of the church ; and parents and guardians are strictly called upon, as early as possible, to bring their children so that they may be dedicated to God :—but it very frequently happens, from accidental circumstances, negligent and irreligious parents, parents differing from the doctrines of the Church of England ; that orphans, or deserted children ; or others having grown up to man's estate, become, under God's grace,

sensible of the religious obligations under which they stand towards God, and would desire to be partakers in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, even as they behold their companions and equals in age. But it is evident, from what I have already stated, that they would be incapable of so doing. They would be strangers and foreigners towards God. They would be alienated from Him, and must not think that they can in any case dispense with the previous Sacrament of Baptism. Do not let them imagine, that Baptism is meant for infants only, that it was only little children in body that Christ commanded to be brought unto Him. It was little children in religion also. Do not let them imagine, that Christianity is merely an internal emotion of the feelings, and disdains those outward helps which forms and ceremonies furnish, that they may be baptized of the Spirit, may feel the inward regeneration of the soul, without the outward form of water. Jesus Himself said not only, "Except a man be born of *the Spirit*," but he said, "Except a man be born of *water*, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." He was Himself baptized. It became Him to fulfil all righteousness. He was baptized according to the baptism of John, in the river Jordan; and God the Father gave testimony to God the Son, and

God the Holy Ghost descended in the form of a dove, confirming the seal of the new covenant, and thus displaying to the world the commencement of that ordinance, which was afterwards more fully developed in His parting words: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Baptism, then, was appointed by Jesus Christ Himself as a sacrament, and the way of admittance into His Church; and we cannot question its value, or deny its obligation. Jesus Himself is the door, and we must not seek admittance by any other door; but, like the eunuch of Queen Candace, by repenting of our sins, and believing with all our heart; there is nothing, whatever our age may be, which will prevent our baptism. The Church recognises it, and has set apart a service expressly for it; and this being once done, we may then, in company with our associated brethren, communicate in the Supper of our Lord.

II. Next to Baptism, and as an appendage to Baptism, there is another ordinance which the Church has considered as a fit preparation for the Eucharist. It is that of Confirmation—The laying of the hands of the bishop on such as have been baptized, and have arrived at years of dis-

cretion. The obligations of Baptism being entered into as infants, while the mind is yet immature and unconscious of the real nature of Christianity, and when the solemn pledges of faith and repentance, being unintelligible to the baptized person, have been undertaken in their names by sponsors ; it seems natural, that there should be a time when the baptized persons, in their own name, may ratify that which was pledged for them by others. This is Confirmation. It is a ceremony of our Church, taken from that account, which is given in the Acts of the Apostles, of the Church of Samaria. S. Philip the deacon went down to Samaria, and baptized, in the name of the Lord Jesus, a very great number of new converts. And when the apostles at Jerusalem heard this, they proceeded thither themselves, and “laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.” In imitation of this, our bishops lay their hands on the baptized persons presented to them at the altar. The person so presented takes upon himself, in the presence of God and of the congregation, the solemn vows and promises of the Christian profession, and the bishop, laying on his hands, prays for the gift of the Holy Spirit, to direct and sanctify the renewed promise, and to confirm and establish the heart in every good

word and work: "Defend, O Lord, this thy servant, with thy heavenly grace, that he may continue thine for ever; and daily increase in thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come into thine everlasting kingdom."

How necessary our Church considers this ceremony as a preparation for communion in the Eucharist, we may gather from the rubric direction, at the end of the service: "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." This last expression, "*or be ready and desirous to be confirmed,*" shows that we do not look upon the ceremony of Confirmation in the same light as that of Baptism; the one being defined in our Catechism, "as generally necessary to salvation," but the other not mentioned in the Catechism as a Sacrament, but only an apostolic rite following Baptism, and not to be neglected, unless under the pressure of peculiar and urgent circumstances. If such circumstances should occur, such as the absence of the bishop, or sudden attack of sickness before the time of the bishop's attendance, or any such temporal chances, then it appears to be the desire of our Church, that the Christian should not wait for Confirmation, but pass on directly to the more important Sacrament of the Eucharist.

But then a person so coming to the holy Eucharist must be able conscientiously to say that the opportunity has never been at hand. Though not a Sacrament—though not necessary to salvation, as Sacraments are, yet this holy ordinance contains so many advantages in itself, contains so valuable a means of grace, and is so singularly appropriate to the time of life when it is generally performed, that it cannot fail to create a deep and lasting impression on the heart of the serious disciple of the Lord. It is a wise and wholesome preparation, a self-scrutiny, a casting back of the mind upon the unconscious period of infancy, when our parents in the Lord presented us in His temple, and consecrated us to the service of Him who guarded our tender years from harm, and trained our youthful minds in the acquisition of that knowledge which bringeth peace on earth and salvation in heaven. And it is a looking forward of the mind to the hidden future of manhood; to that future so pregnant with danger, so pregnant with uncertainty—just at that season when we are, as it were, on the threshold of life, when the world is opening to us its fair appearing scenes of pleasure and of ambition; when the temptations both of sense and intellect are just beginning to have sway, and the evil one is standing by to show us “all the kingdoms of the

world, and the glory of them," and to say, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Therefore it is that we need at this moment, more than at any other period of our life, strength and stimulus to encourage us in our unequal combat; the voice of admonition to warn, and the voice of prayer and appeal to God for help, and guidance, and grace; prayer, not only of ourselves but also of the assembled congregation, and of the bishop and pastor of the flock. Confirmation gives all this. A service most valuable therefore is it to every class of men, and never wilfully to be neglected by the Christian in his search for every means of grace, and every hope of glory.

A question is often raised, whether the rite of Confirmation should be administered even after the Eucharist has been habitually received. It is one of those questions to which no general answer can be given. Where such persons as have unavoidably, or from inattention, neglected the former rite, feel a desire, and are of opinion in their own hearts that Confirmation may prove a source of blessing to them, it certainly should be pursued. It is hardly possible to conceive a case where the laying on of hands by the Bishop would not prove a blessing; and it is hardly possible to conceive a case, where the open profes-

sion of faith before the Church would not be requisite. But the Church has not pronounced any authoritative opinion: therefore we must as individuals abstain from doing so. But while we cannot say it is positively necessary, still we may very strongly advise and exhort, so that no man be found in the ordinances of his Church deficient. Another question is sometimes raised, whether a person is not *too old* to be confirmed? To this we can decidedly answer in the negative. It is the bounden duty of every Christian, without any limit of age, to receive the Eucharist, and previous to the Eucharist to be confirmed. We can never be too old to do our duty; and if that duty has been neglected while young, we can never be too old to repair that negligence.

III. Such are the general and ecclesiastical qualifications with which men must be endued in order to present themselves at the table of the Lord. But to these there must be added the especial and personal qualifications of the heart and of the mind. Our Church Catechism, to the question, "What is required of persons who come to the Lord's Supper?" answers, "To examine themselves whether they repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life, have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, and be in charity with all men."

Here the qualifications are stated to be:—i. Repentance ; ii. Universal charity ; iii. A thankful remembrance of Christ's death ; all which relate to *time past* ; iv. A steadfast purpose to lead a new life ; and v. A lively faith in God's mercy through Christ ; which have reference to *the future*.

Repentance stands first, and by repentance we must understand abject contrition and sorrow for our general depravity, and more especially for our individual sins. We must consider it to embrace humility, consciousness of our unworthiness, and a prostration of all merits on our part before the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. When we remember the things which Christ has done, we are bound to remember the character of those for whom they were done. We must never forget the miserable, degraded state of our nature inherited from Adam : and without entering into any philosophical disquisition as to the justice of God in punishing the sins of the fathers upon the children, but looking first at the facts which we see, and the feelings of evil which we bear in our own hearts, and then confirming these facts by an appeal to the Scriptures of Almighty God, where they are explained in the account of Adam's disobedience ; we must confess the rebellious, obstinate, wilful character which the human race has

ever displayed towards the Creator of the world, despising His law, mocking at His commandments, and even when He sent His only Son to reclaim them, to teach them, and to die for them, still to a great extent disbelieving and rejecting Him. "He came to his own, and His own received Him not." They crucified Him, and "put Him to an open shame."

Now we are a part of that race of beings who did this. It is *our nature* which, throughout the history of the world, presents one continued scene of the most extraordinary and wilful blindness, the most hard-hearted rejection of the loving-kindness of God; murmuring in the wilderness, though His miracles of love were continual; setting up the idols of Egypt, though His express command was to worship the Lord God, and Him alone; refusing the voice of His prophets, who from time to time were sent to admonish and to warn. It was *our human nature* which did this. We ourselves might have done the same thing had we been placed in the same situation. We might have been the very Jews who nailed the Saviour to the cross; as we do in fact by the sins of which we are guilty at this present moment. We might have been the Judas Iscariot who betrayed, or the Pontius Pilate who unjustly condemned—the Peter who denied his Master, or the

Ananias who lied unto the Holy Ghost. It is *our nature* which was capable of these things; *our nature* which we have to lament and bewail as utterly sinful in God's sight.

But not only this general view of sin. We must also descend into particulars. Each of us must lay our hands upon those individual instances where this sinful nature has been developed. We must search out our hearts, and commune with them in our chambers, and be still. To talk of sin abstractedly, to detail the weaknesses and the failures of other men, without going into any examination of our own, would only engender spiritual pride—would only beget in us a complacency and self-satisfaction, utterly ruinous to all hope of salvation. We must, therefore, in the words of the apostle, “*examine ourselves*”—“sift ourselves as wheat”—“try out our reins and our heart,” and if there be any evil thing, draw it forth, and confess it to God, in all sorrow and contrition. Who that does so, who that considers seriously and honestly the movements of his thoughts, and words, and actions, for a single day, will not have need to wish many things undone which have been done, and many things done which have been omitted? who will not have to exclaim—how perverse, how unbelieving, how discontented, how worldly-minded

have I been; and, therefore, how odious in the sight of God must I appear? “Lord, be merciful to me a sinner?” Who can look upon himself, and then look up to God, and not burst forth into the impassioned and ardent language of the prodigal: “Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son?”

“He that repents truly is greatly sorrowful for his past sins, not with a superficial sigh or tear, but a pungent afflictive sorrow; and such a sorrow as hates the sin so much, that the man would choose to die rather than act it any more. This sorrow is called in scripture, a “weeping sorely, a weeping with bitterness of heart, a weeping day and night; a sorrow of heart, a breaking of the spirit, a mourning like a dove, a chattering like a swallow.”* We cannot *all*, or any of us, *at all times*, feel the intensity of grief for sin which is here depicted. The degree of sorrow for sin will depend greatly on the degree of sin; and as we do not all sin equally, we cannot all feel the same depth of repentance: but there remains plenty of opportunity even for the best. “In Christianity,” says Archbishop Secker, “repentance is the foundation of every thing. Now the sorrow that we ought to feel for the least sin

* Bishop Jeremy Taylor.

must be a very serious one, and for greater offences, in proportion, deeper. But the vehemence and passionateness of grief will, on every occasion, and particularly on this, be extremely different in different persons. And, therefore, all that God expects is, a sincere, though it may be a calm, concern for every past fault of which we are conscious, and for the multitudes which we have either not observed or forgotten." There is only required the honest examination; and though we may not have the heart-breaking of David, when he mourned for his murder and adultery; though we may not need the bitter weeping of Peter, when he said, with oaths and curses, "I know not the man;" still the carnal lusts, daily excited, the impure motives, daily suggesting unhallowed actions, even the good actions daily intermingled with, and springing out of impure designs; "the good that we would, that not doing, and the evil that we would not, that doing;"—all, or any, are quite sufficient for the best of us to seek the Lord, if, haply, we can find Him, in the holy Feast of the Eucharist; to seek Him with a contrite heart, and a bruised spirit, to inquire out the weaknesses and indiscretions, the aptness to temptation, and the secret ulcers which may lie under the surface of a healed skin, to lay them bare with the keen

knife of self-examination; to search for the Physician of souls in humiliation, in sorrow, in confession.

“Repent ye, and believe the gospel,” said our blessed Redeemer Himself. Previous to believing the gospel, *repentance* was the preparation: and even so, were He to speak on earth again, His blessed words would be, now that the gospel is believed, if haply it *is* believed—“Repent ye, and receive the Eucharist.”

iv. The next qualification which we must possess is *universal charity*. We are naturally and easily led to this from repentance: for what greater arguments can there be to lower our pride than a remembrance of our infirmities—to decrease the difference between ourselves and others, than remembering the difference between ourselves and God, to put in contrast the wrongs done to ourselves, by calling to mind our own wrongs done towards our Heavenly Father, to show us the love which we should bear to others, by dwelling on that love which caused Jesus Christ to die for our sins: but all these things belong to repentance.

Christian charity embraces first a universal brotherly love: this is surely evident from the many express commands which Jesus gave: “One is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.”

Here, in the Lord's Supper, we meet as brethren, united in one family, and joined by one covenant, partaking of one worship, celebrating the memory of one Saviour, through Him and in Him joint heirs of the same kingdom. It is this notion of equality which is the peculiar character of the Eucharistic feast; equality, not in worldly things, but in heavenly things; equality, not as touching the honours or privileges of men, but as touching the glories of that kingdom which Jesus Christ has promised, as touching the sins, the follies, the infirmities of human nature, of which we all, rich and poor, are the joint possessors. Here no righteous pharisee dares to say to the overburdened publican: "Stand off, for I am holier than thou;" or, lifting up his voice to God: "I thank thee that I am not as other men are." Here no Dives dares to bring the privileges of birth, or wealth, or power, to compete with the privileges of the Christian, and the treasure which is in heaven, and the power of that Holy Spirit which sanctifieth the people of God. No, the master and the servant, the householder and his labourers, the inhabitant of palaces, and he who from day to day earns the hard pittance of his daily bread, rude and unpolished;—all differences and distinctions which this imperfect world renders necessary, and which very differences are a mark of its imperfec-

tion—all being cast aside—before the same altar they kneel, brethren in the Lord.

“A new commandment give I unto you,” said Jesus, “that ye love one another:” of course, if we remember that we are “*brethren*,” we must love one another. This work betokens love, it puts aside all pride, for one is not better than another. It puts aside all fear, for perfect love casteth out fear, and looking only to Him who is the head of all, the great disparity between ourselves and that Head merges and swallows up all disparity between ourselves. “A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another.” This commandment was given shortly after the institution of the Eucharist. It was given while the Twelve were sitting by the side of that great Master who gave Himself as the example, “as *I* have loved *you*,” and how? By dying: and it was indeed a perfectly new commandment, new to the Gentile, new to the Israelite, for it was said by them of old: “Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy.” Now this new commandment made no such distinction; “But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you,

and persecute you ;” and this upon the principle of the love of God towards man : “ for He maketh his sun to rise upon the evil and upon the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.”

There must, therefore, not only be a general and abstract love, a benevolent and peaceful disposition towards all mankind, but it must descend into all the jars and offences of private and individual life. There must be a readiness to forgive injuries, a desire of remission of all trespasses between man and man, a restraint upon the evil passions and turbulent feelings of envy, malice, and all uncharitableness. This, too, was a new commandment; for, “ it was said by them of old, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth ;” but Christ said, “ Resist not evil ; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.” It must be that offences will come. Our paths in life are continually crossing one another. Interests will clash ; tempers will be warm ; evil passions will break out. But, as a right qualification for the Lord’s Supper, we must have a heart free from all this strife and malignity of the world ; we must cast aside all save that which is of charity—charity in thoughts as well as in actions, for charity in the oppressed “ suffereth long ;” in the unsuccessful and unfortunate, “ envieth not ;” in the prosperous, “ vaunteth not it-

self, and is not puffed up." Charity, in the injured, "is not easily provoked;" in the righteous, "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth;" in the poor, "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things;" in the rich, "doth not behave itself unseemly, and seeketh not her own." Charity, in all, of every degree, and of every temper, "never faileth."

Ye, therefore, that come unto the Lord's table must come with charity. You must cast your mind abroad upon your intercourse with man; if no difference exist either in judgment or in action, between you and your brethren, come at once with safety and with joy. But if there should be differences or offences, then your rule must be that of your Redeemer: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."* Be not deceived with any subterfuges

* This passage is quoted by several of the fathers, and the word "gift" is interpreted to mean worship, alms, or oblations; and the Apostolical Constitutions explain it by prayer, praise, or thanksgiving; and it is, of course, evident that any of these gifts could not be accepted at the altar of God, unless offered with a peaceful mind, and with charity in the heart, as well as in the hand. When we are told in the above text to be reconciled to our brother, it does not imply that in case our brother should refuse to be reconciled to us, we should still be debarred from

of your own, saying, I will forgive, but not *forget*; or by any false principle of worldly honour, refusing to extend the hand of Christian forgiveness, because the *world* says that you may not. If you have rightly employed yourselves on the first qualification,—that of repentance; if you have searched your hearts even as David, after his great and appalling sins against reason and against God: and have cried out with him, as you, no doubt, in many instances, ought to do: “Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy loving-kindness, according to the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions,” you cannot, then, refuse the mercy that is asked on *your* part. You cannot with one hand be pleading forgiveness, and the other be rejecting that which is demanded. You will not surely be imitating that debtor described in the parable of our blessed Saviour, who had been forgiven a debt of ten thousand talents, and went and cast his fellow-servant into prison for a debt of a hundred pence: you will not make a mockery of the words when you say to God, night and morning, “Forgive us our trespasses

the benefits of the sacrament. If we have endeavoured, on our own part, to become reconciled—making restitution, and seeking forgiveness, then it matters not if our brother should still withhold the forgiveness which has been asked. The sin, in that case, remains with him, and not with us, and we may approach the altar with perfect safety. - See this more fully discussed in Waterland's Review, chap. xiii.

as we forgive them that trespass against us ;” but you will blot out all minor differences of opinion and of action—all offences, all the discords, all the animosities, which must, in spite of the most well-intentioned and best-regulated mind, be continually occurring—you will blot them all out, and sink them in the great redemption and pardon which Jesus has obtained for *you*. You will remember His especial and admonitory words: “ If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him ; and if he repent, forgive him : and if he trespass against thee seven times a-day, and seven times a-day turn again to thee, saying, I repent ; thou shalt forgive him.”

v. We must *have a thankful remembrance of Christ's death*—*i. e.*, we must remember Christ's death with gratitude, and that gratitude will embrace admiration, and honour, and love. *Admiration* in the spectacle of an incarnate God dying for the sins of men. What can possibly be conceived more wonderful? His incarnation, death, resurrection, ascension, daily intercession at the right hand of God. His mediatorial office—stooping to the infirmities, passions, and wretchedness of man, yet elevated to the power and dignity of God ; consulting and warning as in human flesh subsisting, yet pleading and extenuating as equal and coeternal with the Godhead ; redeeming us

with the voluntary shedding of His own blood as the Son of Man, yet sitting on His eternal throne of judgment, as the all-knowing and all-mighty Son of God; born as a lowly babe in the common manger of a common inn; living in the midst of lowliness and of poverty, as a common mechanic; scourged and spitted on, and crucified as a common malefactor; yet, nevertheless, overcoming all, enduring all, despising the shame, and rising again from death (because He could not be holden of death) the glorified Son of God, the innocent, the pure. And there He still remains. There He ever sits at the right hand of His Father, the bright and glorious Potentate, whose praises and whose hallelujahs, the martyrs, and saints, and prophets, cherubim and seraphim continually do cry.

These indeed are things which merit our admiration, which cause us to gaze in astonishment at the immensity of God's ways, which cause us to dwell upon the glories which Jesus has wrought on our behalf with wonder and with awe.

Our remembrance of His death must also be with *honour*. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent Him."

Here we see how closely interwoven the one is with the other. If we are bound to honour the Father as our Creator, so also the Son, because by Him, saith S. John, “all things were made, and without Him was not any thing made that was made.” If we are bound to honour the Father as our preserver, because from day to day He supplies us with food and with raiment, and with all things that tend to our comfort, and to our happiness—so also the Son, for He is our preserver against all evil which may assault and hurt the soul; sending, as He promised, the Comforter to guide us into all godliness, and to save us from the power of that evil one, who is ever “going about seeking whom he may devour.” If we are bound to honour the Father as giving us the Revelation of His will in the law, as placing before us the great precepts of holiness which shall make us, if obeyed, His perfect children—so also the Son, who “came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it;” who came not to enforce it to that letter which killeth, but to the spirit which maketh alive; who came to show us in the gospel another and a more full revelation of His will: not only doing it in word, but in fact; not only by precept, but by a living example. The honour of the Son then is the honour of the Father, and the honour of the Father is the honour of the Son.

“ Jesus said, If I honour myself, my honour is nothing. It is my Father that honoureth me, of whom ye say that He is your God.” “ I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me.” But how did the Jews dishonour Christ? Because “ He told them the truth, and they believed Him not.” They refused the faith, they withheld the credence which the evidence of His works demanded; pretending to be the people of God under the law, they refused to be so under the gospel; whereas both went together, and one was only the sequence of the other. But as mercy is a greater gift than justice; and life and immortality a greater boon than temporal glory; and redemption a higher work than creation; so must we honour the Father principally in His Son. So must we say, when we remember the death by which the work of redemption was effected,—Blessing and glory, and honour and power, be unto Him that “ sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.”

But our thankful remembrance must not only convey those feelings which are of a more elevated description, but also the more close and affectionate feelings of *love*; and, why? He had towards *us* those close and affectionate feelings. His care of us was not so much that of a king towards his subjects as of a pastor and shepherd towards his

flock. He came to teach things which we never conceived possible before; He came to suffer things which the utmost generosity of human patience and human disinterestedness never could have imagined as endurable. Our souls were lost, we were condemned past hope, we were as sheep gone astray from the fold, wandering in the wilderness, no food to nourish us, no arm to protect us, no light to cheer us. In the midst of this He approached, He became the shepherd and bishop of our souls. He led us into green pastures, and fed us with spiritual manna from on high, and while we were yet sinners died for us. The wages of sin and the condemnation of the law were changed into the free gift of salvation and grace. The gate of hell He for ever shut, the gate of heaven He for ever opened, and now keeps perpetually open, that all may enter who seek admittance through Him. At that gate He stands inviting us, and keeping a place for His own. There in His glory and His love He stands,—such love as passeth all understanding, intending and preparing for us such high prizes of Christian exaltation, as it enters not into our hearts to conceive; O, hear His words of mercy: “Come unto me, all ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;” hear His words of peace: “Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth

give I unto you ;” hear His words of love: “ As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you ; continue ye in my love.” Then surely before we presume to communicate with Him in that most intimate fellowship of His holy supper, we must ascertain that our hearts are clearly endued with a spiritual love towards Him. Jesus said on one occasion to Simon, “ Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me ?” and this question was repeated three times. O, let us answer even as he answered : “ Lord, thou knowest that I love Thee.” Let us so exclaim, and let it be a faithful, a sincere exclamation on every occasion on which we approach the symbols of His love towards us. Let us be prepared in the fulness of joy, in the fulness of blessing, in the fulness of a heart teeming with solemn and reverential love toward Him who could in no way show greater love for us than this, that He laid down His life for us. “ We have known and believed the love that God hath to us ; God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment, because as He is, so are we in this world. There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love, *we love Him because He first loved us.*”

VI. From considerations of the past, we are to proceed to the future. From the repentance to which our soul has been subjected in recalling our past demerits, we are naturally led to resolutions of future amendment—“*to lead a new life* ;” and from the love with which we have been contemplating the meritorious death of the Redeemer, we are obviously led to *faith in God’s mercy through Christ*. Repentance, if sincere, conveys at once the intention of amendment ; for it signifies not only a remorse and sorrow for the past, but a change of mind, an alteration of the feelings and opinions in regard to sin, and in regard to God. Again, the love of Christ, love of His character, love of His person, love of His doctrines, which are all conveyed in the expression, “a thankful remembrance of Christ’s death,” signifies an intention of keeping His commandments : “Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.” So that repentance and love will work together, under the grace of God, to alter the character, to amend and to improve it, so that it seems impossible that a man can really have “a thankful remembrance of Christ’s death,” without, at the same moment, “steadfastly purposing to lead a new life.” That a person should presume to enter the house of God in any way, even to listen to the exposition of the word of God by His ministers from the

pulpit, even to hear the solemn confession of faith as delivered in the creed, and yet continue to remain in sin, does seem a hardihood and an hypocrisy, of which few would dare to be guilty; but that he should pursue this a step farther, that he should kneel down at the altar, gaze upon the sacramental elements representing that sacrifice of which he was the cause, that body which was broken, and that blood poured out for his sins—that he should dare to partake of those holy symbols with an intention, or any secret reservation, to continue in the sins of which he has been guilty, and to be in future just the same as he was before,—This does seem a depravation of character so frightful, and a hardness of heart so steeled against the grace of God, that, in charity, we must hope and pray that it never can exist. Let us take it for granted that it is impossible: for, we proceed all along upon the supposition that the communicant follows the direction of the apostle, and before he approaches the table, “*examines himself.*” And if he did examine himself, he surely could not then do such violence to God, finding himself in sin, to outrage God’s presence. In the ancient sacrifices, a part of the ceremony consisted in what was called the “inspection,” a close examination, on the part of the priest, that nothing might be offered which had any blemish or mark. And S. Chrysostom

applies this metaphorically to the self-examination required on the part of the communicants: "Wherefore, we ought to inspect ourselves, and all about us. For if, under the old law, they were obliged nicely to look upon every offering, and did not suffer them to bring a sacrifice with a torn ear, or without a tail, or that had a foul ulcer, or was leprous—how much more should we, who do not offer up inanimate creatures, but *ourselves*, be diligent to be pure."—S. Chrys. Hom. xx. Again, the same father beautifully says: "I call upon you with a loud voice, and beg of you, and beseech you, that you do not come with a blemish upon you, and with an evil conscience, to this holy table, for this would not be a communion, though you should a thousand times over touch Christ's body, but it would be your judgment and condemnation. Let, therefore, no sinner come (but I must not say, no sinner, for then I should drive myself away from this holy table), but let no one who continues a sinner come." It is this purposed determination to *continue* in sin, when partaking of the body and blood of Christ, which I am surely justified in saying is impossible.

That we may, after the strongest resolutions of amendment, yet fall back into sin, must be allowed by any one who knows what the infirmity of human nature is. But this may exist

without any violation of sincerity on our part. The two things are perfectly distinct. Yet the resolutions, constantly repeated, must, in the end, though they be broken time after time, prevail. Like the drop of water, which, by continuance, shall wear away the hardest rock, so a good resolution, sincerely formed, and pursued to the best of our powers, however weak that power may be, yet shall, with those helps of grace superadded, which the Christian is supposed to appeal to in this Holy Sacrament, overcome the most seductive temptations, and destroy the most inveterate habits of which the human character is capable. The duty is *to form the resolution*, and to form it with sincerity; to *intend*, to the best of our strength, to wrestle with the evil of our nature; to be guarded against the attacks of our enemy; to be watchful against surprise; and to be prepared against the open attacks, as well as the insidious treachery, which our mortal enemy is ever bringing against us, to the discomfiture of our souls: "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." When we go to the Lord's Supper, we must go with a mind resolutely intending to improve; not lazily satisfied with past attainments, nor quietly indulging

in our present views of religion, but advancing, pursuing onwards, day by day enlarging our views of God's dealing with us, from point to point seeking fresh inducements to virtue, never resting, never content, but looking forward, even if we may so say, to the possibility of being "perfect even as our Father which is in heaven is perfect."

To the man who has been guilty of notorious sin, it is some advance to him to discontinue those sins. Once satisfied of the sinful nature of his past life, he must, of course, as the preliminary of his new life, root out the vicious weeds from the garden of his soul, clean the ground of its rankness and bad fertility, make good use of the spade and of the plough, to prepare an entirely new soil. But this is only the preliminary ; in itself it will not be sufficient. If the soil, however diligently cleansed, however thoroughly ploughed up, be left to itself, if there be no good seed sown therein, the same corrupt weeds that grew before, will grow up again, no one knows whence, and the labour will all be useless. We must not only sweep the house, but garnish it: garnish it, not with frivolous and ornamental furniture, but with that which shall be solid and useful. We must ensure, by careful watching and diligent observation, the storing up gradually of every Christian

grace. "Add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity." Here, at the table of the Lord, we must be present with these intentions. Beholding as we do the cross of Christ, the pains and sufferings which He underwent for the sake of expiating sin, we must resolve at each several time of communicating, to advance in our work of godliness, to approach nearer and nearer to that Divine example which He furnishes in the gospel. He that striveth in the games for mastery is temperate in all things; and if they do it to obtain a corruptible crown, how much more shall we do it for an incorruptible crown. A new life, an advancing life, a life, as far as it is possible, of perfection, is to be the Christian's aim; and God being our helper, the Holy Spirit our guide, and Jesus our intercessor, it may be reasonably hoped that we shall "bring forth fruit in due season, some thirty, some sixty, some an hundred-fold."

VII. Lastly, we are to remember Christ with *faith*. Faith in regard to the past I do not here contemplate, because we could not be called Christians, we could not have been baptized, we could not have been confirmed, without a pro-

fessing belief in the doctrines of Christianity. But it is a faith in regard to the future. Now this again depends upon the previous points which we have already agreed upon ; repentance, and love, and resolutions of obedience ; for why should we repent, unless it were that we believe that pardon will follow ? Why should we love Christ, unless it were that we believe that the sacrifice for which we love Him will procure our salvation ? And again, why should we resolve to advance in our Christian course, unless it were that we believe that “without holiness, no man shall see the Lord ;” and that the righteous shall, in the great day of judgment, “shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father” ? Without this faith, this unreserved confidence in the promises of God, made through His Son Jesus Christ, all religion totters to the ground : “We walk by faith, not by sight.”

This is true even in a temporal sense. The commonest occurrences of every-day life are anticipated, and expected upon the principle of faith. We go forth from our dwellings, and return again in *faith* that we shall find them safe, and that no plague shall have come nigh them in our absence ; we commit seed in the spring-time to the earth, in *faith* that in harvest time it will bring forth fruit for our use and for our suste-

nance. We lay ourselves down upon our bed at night, and though darkness shall cover the earth, yet it is by *faith* that we know another sun shall rise, and the earth shall again be lighted by its golden colours, and man again go forth to his labour until the evening. All this, though ordinary and common, and happening every day, yet it is faith looking to the future, originated and confirmed by our experience of the past.

If this be true then in temporal things, how much more is it true in spiritual things. Our experience of God's goodness in the past; our experience in the details of His dealings with men, as given in the Scriptures, must lead us to believe what He says will be His dealings in the future. Our knowledge of His wisdom, power, and mercy in the past transactions of the world, and in our own personal cases, must lead us to expect the same wisdom, and power, and mercy to be *continued*; and when we see His only Son Jesus Christ, descend upon earth as man, giving testimony of His truth by wonderful miracles, and sealing that testimony by a voluntary and ignominious death—upon faith we proceed immediately to acknowledge that these extraordinary facts could not have taken place without an object; and then finding that this object is openly announced, and that the object so announced

tallies with the rest of God's transactions with the world, what can we do but throw ourselves implicitly upon the promises which He has given, and look forward with as much certainty to the glories of eternal life, as we do to the common transactions of the world as they are developed from day to day.

We approach therefore the holy altar with this faith, this entire dependence on the word of God, this firm conviction in our own minds of the reality, of the efficacy, of the certainty of salvation to be procured by the death of Christ. We must be sure that it is the *only* way (because He says so) by which salvation can be procured, that there is no other name under heaven given to man whereby he may be saved, but only the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. If we think that one good deed will compensate for another evil deed, that one day righteously spent, will be a set off against another spent unrighteously—if we think that the mercy of God can visit us by any other channel than by the merits and death of His Son—if we say, as the Pharisee, “I thank God I am not as other men are,” and thereby claim merit for our own good actions, how can we in that case be approaching the altar with that faith which is necessary to salvation? We shall be robbing the Son of God of His glory, we shall be taking from Him His share in the salvation of

the world, and shall be, in fact, saying to Him, "We should have done as well without Thy sacrifice." But if we lay aside all considerations of self-righteousness, if we trust to the atonement wrought only by Him whose death we commemorate, if we feel our hearts depressed by the burden of our sin, and at the same time are conscious that Jesus is the only one who can relieve us from that burden, if we feel and are sure that from all our errors, negligences, and ignorances, the blood of the Lamb shall cleanse us, if we think and know that He was bruised for our iniquities, and that by His stripes we are healed ; that He, and that He alone, hath blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, nailing it to His cross ; that in that He died, He died unto sin once, but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God ; that He hath ascended on high and led captivity captive, and that He now standeth at the right hand of God, and maketh intercession for the transgressors ; if, I repeat, these great things we look upon as certain, and believe to be facts as told us by God, and then transfer the record of the past, to the fulfilment which is to take place in the future, and apply it personally to ourselves,—if we can say : "I feel that these things belong to *me* as well as to others : I feel that when Jesus Christ died He died for *me*, and that when 'after my skin worms

destroy this body, yet in *my flesh* shall I see God :’ I feel that when this mortal soul shall put on immortality, and corruption shall put on incorruption, then in *my* case, as well as in others, shall be brought to light the saying,—‘ Death is swallowed up in victory,—I wait for this, I know it will come to pass, and when it does come to pass, I know it will come to pass solely, entirely, and unreservedly through the merits of that blessed Redeemer whose body and blood I see before me on the altar of my God, and which, in obedience to His command, I eat and drink in token of my faith ;” then have we the requisite which the Church requires, by which we steadfastly believe the promises of God made to us in that Sacrament.

Such are the thoughts which Jesus would have His disciples to possess. Such recollections of the past will furnish the communicant with joyful anticipations for the future. The past and future connected together by the present, will lead the mind to that pure and peaceful state of happiness, which constitutes the peace of God passing man’s understanding. He will look up to God no longer as the stern and uncompromising exactor of the law, but as the merciful and beneficent author of grace. He will look upon himself no longer as the lost and abandoned creature

which he deserves to be, but as the ransomed of the Lord, the pardoned, and the free. He will go on from strength to strength, from grace to grace. He will wait for that "blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and Saviour Jesus Christ."

And now we have gone through all the qualifications which are necessary for a right approach to the Holy Table of the Eucharist. On these must every man question and examine his own heart and understanding, before he presume to approach. Supposing that we are duly qualified by the general rites of the Church, by baptism; and by confirmation, the only thing then necessary for each individual is to say to his own heart, on *looking back*, "have I love, have I charity, have I repentance?" and *looking forward*, "have I resolutions of amendment, and above all, have I faith?" If "No" be the answer, let him leave his gift at the altar, and go in search of those things which he yet lacketh. By the grace of God he will find them, if he tries. By the grace of God he will soon return, searching for them in the purification of his heart, by the aid of his own rational sense, by meditation on the word of God, and above all by constant, assiduous, humble prayer, for the Holy Spirit to comfort and to teach. And even should it be that of himself he

cannot find them, that of himself he cannot pray, or examine himself, or search the Scriptures ; still the Church has provided a help for him in another. There is the priest—the pastor of the flock—who presides over him in the Lord, to him he can go, and search for advice and ghostly counsel, if he need it. To this we have before alluded, as given in our Prayer Book; the direction of our Church that all who cannot gain comfort for themselves in the retrospect of their sins, and their repentance, should search for the priest, who will hear their confession, and direct them with advice, and give them “the benefit of absolution.” So that no man is destitute, no man is without the means of gaining *in some way* access to God. No man can bring his excuse before God, saying that he knew not how to turn away from sin,—repent and amend. Everything is for him, nothing against him, but himself. Verily there are more for him than against him.

But if “Yes” be the answer; if he can say, “I have examined my heart and conscience faithfully, I behold my Saviour and brethren in love, I look up to my God in repentance and desire of amendment, I behold the Cross of Jesus Christ in all faith, and my own sins in all humility,” then approach, draw near : “Draw near and take this Holy Sacrament to your comfort.” Look

upon the holy symbols of love, of peace, of justification. Look upon the body and blood of your Redeemer with confident and glowing hearts, with reverential looks of piety, with an earnest longing after immortality. Look upon them in the plenitude of your rejoicing, that to you a Saviour is born who has saved His people from their sins; look upon them, and hear through them the voice of your heavenly Master exclaiming: "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself, that where I am ye may be also."

END OF PART I.

THE EUCHARIST.

PART II.

THE DIARY,

CONTAINING

MEDITATIONS AND PRAYERS.

“ When, in my serious thoughts and more retired meditations, I am got into the closet of my heart, and there begin to look within myself, and consider what I am, I presently find myself to be a reasonable creature ; for, were I not so, it would be impossible for me thus to reason and reflect.”—BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

“ Meditate upon these things.”—1 Tim. iv. 15.



THE EUCHARIST.

PART II.

THE DIARY.

THE LORD'S DAY.

EXHORTATION, COMMUNION SERVICE.

“Dearly beloved brethren, on —— I intend, by God’s grace, to celebrate the Lord’s Supper; unto which, in God’s¹ behalf, I bid you all that are here present, and beseech you, for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, that you will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden by God Himself.”

THE MEDITATION.

AND shall I hear these gracious words, and yet refuse? Shall I hear the glad announcement of my Redeemer’s love: “Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest”;^{*} and yet be not ashamed to say, I will not come?

“The bread which I will give is My flesh, which

^{*} Matt. xi. 28.

I will give for the life of the world." "Take, eat: this is My Body." "Drink ye all of this." "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him."

Shall these words meet my ears in the Lord's house, and ever come before me in His Holy Scriptures when I read, and still shall I be deaf and blind; and have a stiff neck, and obey not? It is Thy holy feast of charity and of love. It is the body of Thy Son that Thou invitest me spiritually to eat, the blood of Thy Son that Thou wouldst have me spiritually to drink.

The sacrifice will be ready; the altar will be set forth; the priest will be there to minister. Shall the guests alone be wanting? Shall God send His servants so kindly to invite, and no one hear His voice? Shall He have occasion, because the bidden guests have oxen to prove, or a piece of ground to buy, or wives to marry, to send out into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind?* O, surely not. I also, O my God, if Thou be willing, will be there. I also will bow the knee before Thy altar, and praise Thy name, Most Highest. I also will record the glories of Thy blessed Son, and give Thee thanks for Thine exceeding great goodness. I also will join in

* Luke xiv. 16.

that glad thanksgiving: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will towards men."

But yet, though it be my duty, though it be Thy command, and I dare not refuse Thy solemn invitation, yet I must remember the holiness of this feast; I must bear in mind the solemn character of the joy which shall be mine; I must bear about me the marks of the cross, which I now take up to follow Thee, the blessed Lord of life; I must not only say, Lord, "I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest," and then add, "But suffer me first to go and bury my father;"*—but I must rise up, and forsake all, lands and houses, children and wife, yea, and my life also, if Thou requirest, that I may be Thy disciple.†

And, therefore, let me meditate, let me pause, let me pray: let me use the time which now Thou givest me to prepare myself for this holy feast, so that Thou mayest not have to say, in the midst of my rejoicing, "Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment?"‡

O, Holy Spirit, come, and day by day be with me, to prevent, to strengthen, and to guide: O Saviour intercede, and day by day be with me, to atone for me, to mediate for me, to save me from myself: O God the Father, hear, and day by day

* Luke ix. 59.

† Matt. xix. 29.

‡ Matt. xxii. 12.

be with me, to bless, to pardon, and to receive me into the promises of Thy heavenly kingdom; while I make ready, and gird up the loins of my mind,* and put my shoes on my feet, and take my staff in my hand—"IT IS THE LORD'S PASSOVER."†

THE EXAMINATION.

But I must not thus speak only of *general* rules. I must, according to the word of God, "*examine myself*." This night, therefore, before I sleep, this will I do. O God, hear me, and guide me while I speak.

MY DUTY TO GOD.

Do I believe and consider that God is the CREATOR, PRESERVER, and GOVERNOR of the world, and all things therein? * See Col. i. 16: Nehemiah ix. 6; Ps. xxii. 28.

Do I believe and consider the KNOWLEDGE of God, and therefore that he must see and know every thought of my heart, and every action of my life; and does that consideration make me take heed to all my ways? See Acts xvii. 28; Ps. xliv. 21; Jeremiah xxiii. 33.

* 1 Peter i. 13.

† Exodus xiii. 2.

‡ The texts in this place are only given as references, because it is hoped that the reader may, in order to prove each separate point of examination, turn to his Bible himself, and so ascertain, by his own work, the rule of faith by which he is to live.

Do I believe and consider the GOODNESS of God; and does that consideration create in me love towards Him? and does that love make me desirous in every way to please him? See Ps. xxxiii. 5; Matt. xix. 17; Matt. xxii. 37.

Do I believe and consider the MAJESTY and GREATNESS of God; and does that consideration work in my heart awful and reverent thoughts concerning Him; and do those thoughts, when I compare myself with Him, make me humble?

See Job xxxvi. 26, and xxxvii. 22; 1 Chron. xxix. 11; Ps. xxxiii. 8, and viii. 4.

Do I believe and consider the POWER of God, and does that consideration work in me a fear of His wrath, and a dread lest in any way I should displease Him?

See Ps. lxii. 11; 2 Chron. xxv. 8; Deut. vi. 13; Luke xii. 5.

Do I believe and consider the JUSTICE of God, and does that consideration work in me a certain knowledge that when I shall be weighed in the balance I shall be found wanting?

See Job xxxvii. 23; Rom. ii. 6; Ps. cxliii. 2; Daniel v. 27.

Do I believe and consider the WISDOM of God, and does that consideration work in me a perfect contentment in all that I see going on, knowing that all things are working together for my good?

See Jeremiah x. 12; 1 Tim. i. 17; 1 Samuel iii. 18; Rom. viii. 28.

Do I believe and consider the MERCY of God, and does that consideration work in me a confident hope that, in spite of all my sins, He will yet look upon me in love?

See Daniel ix. 9; Joel ii. 18; 2 Peter iii. 9; Isaiah lv. 7.

Do I believe and consider the TRUTH of God, and does that consideration work in me a faith in all His promises, and a trust in all His words?

See Isaiah lxxv. 16; 2 Peter iii. 9; Heb. vi. 18; Heb. xi. 13.

Do I believe and consider that this God, of whom I speak as my Creator, Preserver, and Governor, of infinite knowledge, goodness, majesty, justice, power, wisdom, mercy, and truth, is ONE GOD; and that, in this unity, there are three persons of equal substance, the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST; and does this consideration work in me wonder and admiration, without diminishing my faith?

See Deut. vi. 4; Matt. iii. 16, 17; Creed of Athanasius; John i. 1—3; Acts v. 3, 4; Mark ix. 24.

Do I believe and consider that the second person in this ever blessed TRINITY is JESUS, the Christ, the only begotten Son of God; and that

He came into the world, born of the Virgin Mary, perfect God and perfect man; and that, by His blood shed upon the cross, I am redeemed from the wrath of God, and saved from my sins?

See Matt. i. 21; Acts ii. 36; John i. 14, 18;
John xviii. 37; Matt. i. 18; John i. 1, 14;
Rev. v. 9; 1 John i. 7.

Do I believe and consider that the third person in the ever blessed TRINITY is the HOLY GHOST; and that by His operation working in me, and communicated to me at Baptism, I have been born again, and made the child of God; and, by His operation still continuing to work within me, I am enabled (and by that alone) to do anything to please God?

See John xiv. 26; John iii. 5; Rom. xv. 13;
Rom. v. 5; Rom. viii. 8.

Do I then believe and consider that, as the result of this faith, my duty is to look upon my soul as not my own, but bought with a price; and my body as not my own, but the temple of the living God; and so take heed to all my ways?

See 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20; Gal. v. 22 to end.

In consequence of all this, do I give myself to PRAYER daily, looking for the protection of God in all my undertakings, and in all my temptations; and, whether I am going out or coming in, acknowledging Him?

See Phil. iv. 6; Luke xviii. 1; Matt. xxvi. 41; Acts xvii. 28; Prov. iii. 6.

If I am successful and prosperous, do I attribute the glory to God? If I fail, and am afflicted, do I remember that it is His doing; and so become thankful for His benefits, and submissive to His chastisements?

See Ps. xxx. 6, compared with Ps. cxv. 1; Job i. 21, and ii. 10; Ps. ciii. 2, 3, 4; Heb. xi. 5.

Have I always remembered the honour due unto His name, and have I kept my tongue from profaneness, blasphemy, swearing, or lightly speaking of the holy things which belong unto Him?

See Ps. xcvi. 8, 9; James ii. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 1.

Do I remember His Holy Scriptures, read them with humility and care, study them, and love them, as the precious things of His gift?

See John v. 29; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16; Ps. cxix. 105.

Do I consider it my duty, and have I practised the duty of making due offerings to God, for the maintenance of His holy religion, the building of churches, the spreading of the gospel, the provision of the clergy, and the education of the poor; and have I done this in PROPORTION TO MY ABUNDANCE, that the things of God may be maintained

in suitable dignity; not grudgingly, or of necessity, but as a cheerful giver?

See Prov. iii. 9; Exodus xxxvi. 5, 6, 7; Matt. xxviii. 18; Matt. vi. 10; Gal. vi. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14; Isaiah xxix. 11, 12; Haggai i. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 7; 2 Sam. xxiv. 24; Job iv. 8.

Do I observe and reverence all the holy ordinances which God has appointed or which man has appointed by the command of God, in regard to holy times, holy places, holy men, and holy things?

See Luke i. 6; 2 Pet. i. 2, 13; Eccles. iii. 1; Rom. xiv. 5, 6, 11; Ps. xxvi. 8; Genesis xxviii. 16, 17; Numb. iii. 3; Heb. v. 1, 4; Exod. xxx. 27, 29; 1 Cor. ix. 13.

In *holy times*, do I observe all the fasts and feasts of the Church, and do I especially reverence the Lord's Day, and sanctify it by a holy rest from profane labour, and from profane pleasures?

See Joel i. 14; Acts xiii. 2; Luke ii. 41, 42; John v. 1; John x. 22; Acts ii. 1; Rev. i. 10; Acts xx. 7; Isaiah lviii. 13.

In *holy places*, do I especially reverence the Lord's House, repairing thither for public worship and prayer, and for the hearing of God's word, and that continually?

See Isaiah ii. 3; Isaiah lvi. 1, 7; Jeremiah xxxvi. 6; Acts ii. 44, 46; Acts xvi. 13; Heb. x. 24, 25; Luke xxiv. 53.

In *holy men*, do I especially reverence the ap-

pointed priests of God, considering them as His ambassadors, and subjecting myself to their authority, esteeming them very highly in love for their work's sake?

See John xx. 22, 23 ; 1 Cor. iv. 1 ; 2 Cor. v. 20 ; Heb. xiii. 17 ; 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.

In HOLY THINGS, do I especially reverence the Sacraments, looking upon them as means of grace, and pledges of God's love, and generally necessary to salvation?

See Mark xvi. 16 ; John iii. 5 ; John vi. 53, 57 ; 1 Cor. xi. 23, 26 ; Church Catechism.

In Holy Baptism, do I consider the position in which I am placed thereby as the child of God, pledged to forsake the lusts of the flesh and of the world ; washed in the laver of regeneration, the Holy Spirit dwelling mysteriously within me ?

See Baptismal Service ; Rom. vi. 6 ; Gal. v. 24, and vi. 14 ; Titus iii. 5, 6, 7 ; Rom. viii. 9.

In the Holy Eucharist, do I consider the sacred elements of bread and wine, as becoming spiritually and really to my soul the Body and Blood of my Redeemer, and so communicating to me a pledge of the forgiveness of sin, and a channel of the Spirit of God?

See Catechism of the Church ; John vi. 56 ; 1 Cor. x. 16 ; Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper.

And for all this, and in all this, do I love God with all my heart, and soul, and strength, worshipping and praising His holy name and His word, and studying to serve Him all the days of my life?

See Matt. xxii. 37 ; Deut. xi. 1 ; Exod. xv. 6 ; Jude 20, 21.

II. MY DUTY TO MY NEIGHBOUR.

Do I consider all mankind, of whatever country, religion, or language they may be, as my FELLOW CREATURES, and do I bear sincere good-will towards them accordingly?

See Leviticus xix. 34 ; Matt. v. 33, 47 ; Luke x. 33 ; 1 Pet. ii. 17.

Do I consider all Christians as peculiarly my BRETHREN, being members of one body, the Church, of which Christ is the head, and do I hold communion with them in love accordingly?

See Gal. iii. 28 ; Rom. xii. 5 ; Ephes. iv. 3, 6 ; 1 John iv. 11 ; John xv. 12.

Since the Body of Christ has many members, and all members have not the same office, do I, if God has set me in a high place, govern and direct the lower members of the body with gentleness and sympathy?

See Isaiah x. 1, 2 ; 1 Thess. v. 14 ; 1 Cor. xii. 22, 23, 25, 26 ; Gal. vi. 2 ; Rom. xv. 1.

Since the Body of Christ has many members, and all members have not the same office, do I, if God has set me in a low place, submit myself to, and obey all those who have authority, and are over me in the Lord?

See Rom. xii. 4, 10; Titus iii. 1; Matt. xxii. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 17.

Do I pay all respect and deference to those who are my *superiors*, either in age, rank, quality, or endowment of any kind, giving honour where honour is due, and tribute, where tribute is due?

See 1 Pet. v. 5; Isaiah iii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 10; Rom. xiii. 1, 7.

Am I courteous, affable, kind-hearted, and kind-spoken to my *equals*?

See 1 Pet. iii. 8; Rom. xii. 10; Titus iii. 2; Gal. v. 22.

Am I kind and indulgent towards my *inferiors*, not exacting more than is my due, but conducting myself in all humility?

See Eccles. vii. 9; Rom. xii. 16; Gen. l. 21; Ephes. iv. 32; Col. iii. 12; Prov. xxv. 6, 7.

Am I compassionate towards the poor, and all who are in affliction, giving alms according to my ability, and doing them good whenever it is in my power?

See Zech. vii. 9; James i. 27; Deut. xv. 7; Luke xi. 41; Rom. xii. 8; Acts x. 38.

Have I entered into personal disputes and contentions with my neighbours, mixing myself up in quarrels, fighting, or duelling, so as to shed the blood of my fellow-creatures?

See James iv. 1, 2; Gen. iv. 10; Gen. ix. 6; Rev. xxi. 8; Exod. xxi. 22, 25.

Have I always laid proper restraint upon my temper, so as not to indulge hatred, anger, malice, or uncharitableness towards any one?

See Ephes. iv. 31; Prov. xxvi. 21; 1 John iii. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 1; James i. 19.

Am I living, or have I ever lived in adultery or fornication, corrupting or debauching the other sex, or do I indulge in any loose way of living contrary to the teaching of Christ?

See Prov. vi. 32; Numb. v. 12; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 18, 20; 1 Thess. iv. 3; Prov. viii. 25.

Have I carefully avoided and prayed against lustful thoughts, and do I avoid light conversation, foolish talking, jesting, and all other excitements to the lusts of the flesh?

See Mark vii. 21; Matt. v. 28; Ephes. v. 4; Col. xxiii. 8.

Have I ever either forcibly or secretly deprived any one of that which is his lawful property, or withheld from him his lawful right?

See Ephes. iv. 28; Prov. xxii. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 10; Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Isaiah iii. 15.

Have I ever, or am I in the habit of imposing upon others in matters of trade or business, by concealing faults, by taking advantage of their ignorance, by oppressing them in their necessities, by exacting usury, or by forcing an immoderate price?

See Lev. xxv. 14 ; 1 Thess. iv. 6 ; Lev. xxv. 17 ; Prov. xxviii. 8 ; 2 Cor. iv. 2 ; Deut. xxv. 13, 16 ; Ezek. xxii. 12, and xxviii. 18.

Have I ever, or am I in the habit of betraying trusts committed to my keeping?

See Ezek. xviii. 12 ; Lev. vi. 2, 5.

Do I make a practice of repaying all that I borrow, and of fulfilling all that I promise?

See Ps. xxxvii. 21 ; Deut. xxiii. 23 ; Neh. v. 13.

Do I avoid all lying, dissembling, and double-dealing, speaking the truth in all honesty and godly sincerity?

See Exod. xxiii. 1, 7 ; Prov. xxiv. 28 ; Col. iii. 9 ; Ephes. iv. 25 ; 1 Pet. ii. 1 ; James i. 8 ; Rev. xxi. 8.

Have I a tender care for the character and good name of my brethren, avoiding all slander, and bad reports, taking no delight either in speaking or hearing evil of others?

See Titus iii. 2 ; James iv. 2 ; Exod. xxiii. 1 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 4, and vi. 10.

In all these matters, in order to keep my *actions* right, have I looked to my *heart*, and so avoided all covetousness, envy, desire of other men's goods, and discontent at my own situation, and way of life?

See Matt. xv. 18, 19 ; Luke xii. 15 ; Ephes. v. 3 ; Rom. i. 29 ; 1 Tim. vi. 6.

If I have ever failed in any of these points, or am now failing in any of them, have I made, or am I willing to make restitution ; if wronged myself, do I forgive ; if wronging others, restore four-fold ?

See Job xx. 18 ; Luke xix. 8 ; Ezek. xxxiii. 15 ; Col. iii. 12, 13 ; Luke xvii. 3, 4.

III. SPECIAL DUTIES.

TOWARDS MY SPIRITUAL PASTOR.

Do I consider him as appointed by God, *His* ambassador and messenger, and set over me by *His* appointment ?

See Heb. v. 4 ; 2 Cor. v. 20 ; 2 Cor. viii. 23 ; John xiii. 20, and xxi. 21.

Do I therefore submit myself to him, listen to his instructions, and bear his admonitions, as from one watching over my soul ?

See Heb. xiii. 17 ; Matt. xxiii. 2, 3 ; Haggai ii. 11.

Do I esteem him very highly in love for his

work's sake, willingly and cheerfully contribute to his support, according to the customs of the Church and commands of God?

See 1 Tim. v. 17 ; 1 Thess. v. 11 : Gal. vi. 6 ; 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14 ; 1 Cor. ix. 7, 11.

Do I make allowance for his infirmities, and consider his difficult office, making mention of him always in my prayers to God?

See Ezek. iii. 17, 19 ; 2 Tim. iv. 21 ; Jerem. xxiii. 1, 2 ; 2 Cor. iv. 7 ; 1 Thess. v. 25 ; 2 Thess. iii. 1 ; Heb. xiii. 8.

In my sins, difficulties, or doubts, do I seek for his advice, and counsel, referring to him as under God, for spiritual consolation and direction?

See James v. 16 ; Haggai ii. 2 ; James v. 14, 15 ; Invitation, Communion Service.

TOWARDS MY PARENTS.

Do I honour and reverence my parents, and obey them in all lawful things?

See Ephes. vi. 1 ; Prov. i. 8 ; Lev. xix. 8 ; Col. iii. 20.

Do I ever secretly wish their death out of impatience to be delivered from their government, or from desire to be possessed of their estate?

See Prov. xx. 20, and xxx. 17 ; 2 Sam. xvii. 4 ; Exod. xxi. 17.

Am I ready to assist them in all their wants

and necessities, concealing their faults, and making allowances for their infirmities?

See Matt. xv. 5 ; Genesis ix. 23.

TOWARDS MY CHILDREN.

Am I diligent in my calling, so that I may bring up my children according to their station, in the faith and fear of God?

See Ephes. vi. 4 ; 1 Tim. iii. 4 ; 2 Cor. xii. 14 ; 1 Tim. v. 8.

Do I watch over them in their education, correcting and encouraging them without favour or partiality, setting them myself a good example in all sobriety and regularity of life?

See Prov. xix. 8 ; Prov. xxix. 15, 17 ; Prov. xiii. 22 ; Heb. xii. 6, 7.

Do I bless, and pray for them, and commend them to the favour and guidance of God?

See Genesis xxvii. 27, 38 ; Genesis xlviii. 16.

TOWARDS MY HUSBAND.

Am I content to live in due subjection and obedience to my husband, according to the will of God, as the weaker vessel?

See Ephes. v. 22, 25, 33 ; 1 Tim. ii. 11, 14 ; 1 Pet. iii. 1, 2.

Am I true and faithful to him in his bed, and in his estate?

See Prov. xii. 4; Prov. xix. 14; Prov. xxxi. 27, 28; Rom. vii. 1, 2, 3.

Am I loving and affectionate towards him, consulting his wishes, and conforming my own habits and ways to his, and rendering his life as happy as I can?

See Prov. xix. 13.

TOWARDS MY WIFE.

Do I love her, and show my love by a kind, tender, and gentle behaviour towards her?

See Col. iii. 19; Ephes. v. 25, 31; 1 Pet. iii. 7.

Am I faithful to her bed?

See Prov. v. 15, 18, 19; Prov. v. 20; Malachi ii. 14, 15.

Am I careful to provide for her whatever is needful, according to her station and according to my own power?

See Gen. ii. 18, 22, 23; 1 Tim. v. 8.

TOWARDS MY MASTER.

Do I obey my master in all lawful commands, cheerfully, actively, and in obedience to God, whose Providence has set him over me?

See Ephes. vi. 5, 8; Col. iii. 22.

Am I faithful to him in all his business and concerns, not taking advantage of his absence, nor

wasting his goods, nor deceiving him by fraud of any kind, or purloining, or lying?

See Col. iii. 22; Titus ii. 9, 10.

Do I meekly and patiently submit to his correction, without answering again?

See Titus ii. 9, 10; 1 Pet. ii. 18, 19.

TOWARDS MY SERVANT.

Am I just to my servant, in performing the conditions upon which he gave himself to my service, paying him that which is due, and freely allowing him the necessaries and conveniences of life?

See Col. iv. 1; Ephes. vi. 9; Lev. xxv. 46; Job xxxi. 13, 15.

Do I speak gently and with forbearance to him, admonishing him not in anger, but with calmness and gravity?

See Ephes. vi. 9; Ephes. iv. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24.

Do I set him an example of sobriety, godliness, and religion, in my own life and conversation?

See 1 Tim. iv. 12; Titus ii. 2; 1 Tim. vi. 11.

Do I encourage his living soberly and religiously by proper marks of kindness and favour, giving him full opportunity of worshipping God, of attending the Lord's house, and of receiving the

Holy Eucharist; and do I point out these duties, and admonish him concerning them?

See 2 Pet. ii. 12; Rom. xv. 14.

IV. MY DUTY TO MYSELF.

Do I believe and consider myself created by the Almighty power of God, either for an *eternal life of* HAPPINESS, or an *eternal life of* MISERY?

See Rom. vi. 23; Rom. ii. 8, 9, 10; Daniel xii. 2; Matt. xxv. 31-46.

Do I believe and consider myself as by my birth a fallen creature, and subject to the WRATH OF GOD?

See Ephes. ii. 3; Ps. xiv. 1, 2, 3; Gal. iii. 22; Rom. iii. 9-19; Rom. iii. 23; 1 John v. 19.

Do I believe and consider myself as redeemed from this wrath by Baptism, and restored to God's favour by the *sacrifice of His only begotten Son*?

See Rom. v. 6, 8; 1 Pet. iii. 18-21; Gal. iii. 13; Heb. ix. 11-26; Heb. ii. 9-15; John i. 29.

Do I believe and consider that notwithstanding this redemption, I am still in a state of very great imperfection, subject to pain and trouble, very ignorant, very weak and insufficient, surrounded by dangers and temptations, and subject to DEATH?

See Job xiv. 1; Rom. viii. 22, 23; Isaiah lix. 8, 9, 10; 1 Cor. i. 20; 2 Cor. iii. 5;

John xix. 11 ; 1 Cor. x. 13 ; Heb. ix. 27 ;
Rom. v. 12.

Do I consider that, after death, I shall be called upon to give account of every thought, word, and deed done in the flesh, before the judgment-seat of Christ ?

See Acts xvii. 31 ; Rom. ii. 16 ; 2 Tim. iv. 1 ; Rev. xx. 13 ; 2 Cor. v. 10 ; Matt. xxiv. 36.

Do I consider that it is my duty to live a life of continual preparation and readiness to die, so as to meet this judgment ?

See Deut. xxii. 29 ; 2 Kings xx. 1 ; Matt. xxv. 1-13 ; Rev. xxii. 20 ; Matt. xxiv. 42 ; Luke xii. 36-40.

Do I consider, therefore, that it is my duty not only to cast out every sin, but to stir up within me all the graces and virtues of the gospel, after the example of Christ ?

See Rom. vi. 12, 13, 18, 22 ; Heb. xii. 1 ; 1 John iii. 9 ; Rom. xii. 6 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 1 ; 1 Philipp. i. 11.

Upon this principle, do I cast out all self-righteousness, and cultivate humility ?

See Luke xviii. 9-14 ; 2 Cor. x. 12 ; 1 Cor. iv. 7 ; 1 Cor. iii. 18 ; 1 Cor. i. 27-29 ; Rev. iii. 17.

Do I cast out all self-indulgence, and cultivate self-denial ?

See Luke ix. 23 ; Matt. v. 29, 30 ; Rom. xiii. 14 ; Coloss. iii. 5 ; Luke xvi. 19-31 ; Luke xviii. 29, 30.

Do I attribute all the evil which I do to MY OWN INABILITY, and all the good which I do to the GRACE OF GOD ?

See Rom. vii. 14-24 ; Ps. li. 2, 3 ; Rom. xi. 6 ; 2 Cor. iii. 5 ; 1 Cor. xv. 10 ; 2 Cor. i. 12.

Am I *contented* in that situation of life, residence, country, or calling, in which God has placed me ?

See Phil. iv. 12 ; 1 Cor. vii. 20, 21 ; 1 Tim. vi. 8, 9 ; Prov. xxx. 8, 9 ; 1 Cor. vii. 30-32.

Am I *temperate* in the use of food, drink, clothing, houses, and lands, and all the comforts and luxuries of life ?

See Luke xii. 29-31 ; Prov. xxiii. 1, 3, 20 ; 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25 ; Isaiah v. 8-22 ; Matt. vi. 18, 19 ; Luke xvi. 19.

Am I *chaste* in my own person, and *modest* towards others in regard to the fleshly lusts, keeping both my body and my soul free from all pollution and uncleanness ?

See 1 Thess. iv. 4-7 ; 1 Tim. v. 1, 2, 14, 22 ; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, 13, 18 ; 2 Tim. ii. 21, 22 ; Matt. v. 8.

Do I carefully avoid all such objects, discourses,

occupations, and company, as might be apt to excite *filthy desires* in my heart?

See Prov. vi. 24-27; Matt. v. 28; 1 Cor. vii. 2, 9.

In order to counteract and subdue my natural propensity to *selfish indulgence, pride, and lust*, do I practise the duty, as enjoined me by God and the Church, of FASTING?

See Luke v. 33, 34, 35; Matt. vi. 16, 17; Acts xiii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 5.

Do I spend much time in SLEEP, beyond what is requisite for the refreshment of my body?

See Prov. vi. 6-11; Matt. xiii. 25; Mark xiii. 36; Ephes. v. 14; Prov. xx. 13.

Do I spend much time in immoderate *eating or drinking*, being delicate in my food, or curious to gratify my palate?

See Luke xxi. 34; Ephes. v. 18; 1 Thess. v. 7, 8; Gal. v. 16-22; Phil. v. 19; Luke xvi. 19.

Do I spend much time in immoderate or useless PLEASURES, or in frivolous pursuits of any kind?

See 2 Tim. iii. 4; Luke viii. 14; 2 Pet. ii. 13; 1 Tim. v. 6.

Do I spend much time in the vanities of DRESS?

See 1 Tim. ii. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 3.

Do I spend much time in the pursuits of
WORLDLY HONOUR OR WORLDLY RICHES, so as to
cause me to forget God and religion?

See John v. 44; 1 Tim. vi. 10, 14; Mark iv.
19; Luke viii. 14.

Do I spend much time in SINFUL OR WORLDLY
SOCIETY, so as to suffer my mind to be drawn
away from the society of God?

See Prov. v. 3-12; Ps. cix. 63; Prov. i.
10-15; 2 Cor. vi. 14; 1 Cor. v. 9, 10, 11.

Do I practise the duty of SELF-EXAMINATION,
SELF-ABASEMENT, PRAYER, and CONFESSION, as
daily tributes to God of my uncertain and imper-
fect state?

See 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Haggai i. 7; Isaiah xxvi.
20; Luke xiv. 11; James iv. 10; 1 Pet.
v. 6; Ephes. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 6; Luke
xi. 1; 2 Cor. vii. 11; Luke xv. 18, 19;
James v. 16; 1 John i. 9.

Is all that I do, whether great or little, towards
God or towards man, faithfully and sincerely done,
not for my own glory, but solely for the GLORY OF
GOD?

See 1 Cor. x. 31; Col. iii. 17.

A PENITENTIAL EXERCISE.

Thus having examined my heart and conscience,

and having found many imperfections therein, especially*

nay, more than imperfections, having found many wilful sins, and direct breaches of God's holy commandments, especially*

what remains for me, but to turn unto God in REPENTANCE? Like David, I will acknowledge my sin; and my iniquities shall ever be before me. Like David, I will cry aloud, "I have sinned against the Lord." O let the prophet of God's infinite mercy say, "The Lord hath put away thy sin."

But, then, repentance is a difficult work. To be genuine, and therefore acceptable in God's sight, it must be carefully examined *itself*, lest, after all, I should be deceiving myself with a vain shadow, and my sins should still remain as red as scarlet. Repentance has these constituent parts:—

I. CONTRITION.

Do I *grieve* for my sins? Do I really grieve, not because God's wrath has visited me with some heavy punishment, but because my sin is

* Here express the particular occasions, and fill up the blank space with the particulars, as the case may be.

odious in God's sight? Is my soul vexed and disquieted within me? Am I dissatisfied with myself? Do I go about mourning all the day long? are the sins of my youth,—the sins of infirmity, of accident, of wilfulness, of habit,—are they all become a burden to me, too heavy for me to bear? Do I afflict myself with the thoughts of them? Am I content to bear the chastisements which are due to them, and to submit myself to God's wrath, "and to be punished in this world, that my soul may be saved in the day of the Lord"?* If so, I have the first part of true repentance. Godly sorrow is working within me. "A bruised and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise."

II. FORSAKING THE PAST.

That which has caused us grief—which has caused us vexation and punishment—we hate; and that which we hate, we are ready to forsake. If, then, the past sins of my life have caused me grief, I shall surely hate them; and, if I hate them, then I shall be ready to forsake them. If I do *not* forsake them, my repentance is vain. Am I, then, ready to forsake them? Am I ready to cast away all the ungodliness which I have done, "to pluck out the right eye which offends

* Commination Service.

me, and cast it from me; to cut off the right hand which offends me and cast it from me; seeing that it is better that one of my members should perish, than that my whole body should be cast into hell"? Now, am I ready, and am I determined, to do this—to cease from my fornication, adultery, impureness of body and of mind; to drop all angry feelings, malice, and revenge; to put down all envy, covetousness, and pride; to cease from vanity, frivolous and carnal habits; to give up the world, and the cares of the world, and mammon, and sin? *Am* I ready and willing, and do I desire to cease from all this, as from a hated and polluted thing, and turn unto the living God? If so, I have the second part of repentance; and it is grateful in God's sight. "*Turn ye (saith the Lord) from all your wickedness, and your sin shall not be your destruction. Cast away from you all your ungodliness that ye have done: make you new hearts, and a new spirit. Wherefore will ye die, O ye house of Israel; seeing that I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God. Turn ye, then, and ye shall live.*"*

III. AMENDMENT FOR THE FUTURE.

Of that which we hate and forsake we must love the contrary; and that which we love we shall

* Commination Service.

pursue. But if we hate and forsake the devil and the world, we shall love God and religion. If we hate sins, we shall love virtues. If we forsake *evil* works, we shall pursue *good* works. Now, am I determined to walk henceforth in the ways of God? Am I content to make my whole soul and body a living sacrifice unto God?

“ They that do, from the bottom of their hearts, acknowledge their sins, and are unfeignedly sorry for their offences, will cast off all hypocrisy, and put on true humility and lowliness of heart: they will not only receive the physician of the soul, but also, with a most fervent desire, long for Him. They will not only abstain from the sins of their former life, and from all other filthy vices, but also flee, eschew, and abhor all the occasions of them. And as they did before give themselves to uncleanness of life, so will they from henceforward with all diligence give themselves to innocence, pureness of life, and true godliness. We have the Ninevites for an example, who at the preaching of Jonas did not only proclaim a general fast, and that they should every one put on sackcloth, but they all did turn from their evil ways, and from the wickedness that was in their hands. But, above all others, the history of Zacchæus is most notable. For, being come unto our Saviour Jesus Christ, he did say, Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have defrauded

any man, or taken ought away by extortion or fraud, I do restore him fourfold."

Thus speaks our Homily of repentance. Am I ready, on this principle of being actively employed in good, as in some sort an acknowledgment of past evil,—am I ready to give up myself to penitential exercises, to practices of devotion, and to the various good works of the gospel of Jesus Christ?

But what are these good works?

First, PRAYER. Secretly in my closet, do I intend henceforward to shut to my door, and commune with my God in prayer? Publicly, in the house of the Lord, at the times and according to the customs of the Church, do I intend to lift up holy hands in litanies and intercessions; not forsaking the assembling of myself together with my brethren, as my manner has been hitherto?

Secondly, FASTING. Withdrawing my body and my mind, at certain seasons, from all which approaches the idea of indulgence; abstaining, at the times commanded by the Church, from meats and drinks; mortifying myself, and denying myself for the sake of Christ Jesus. Do I faithfully intend to do this, as an outward mark of my inward sorrow, according to my ability and my opportunities?

Thirdly, ALMS DEEDS.* Do I intend to imitate good Cornelius, and “give much alms to the people”? or faithful Dorcas, so that the “widows may stand round me weeping, and show the coats and garments which I make”? Do I intend to be among those to whom Jesus will say, “Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me”? If I *do* intend this, and shall by God’s grace succeed in my intention, then shall I have reason to think that my repentance is accepted in the sight of God.

But then, on the other hand, I must take care, lest when I speak of these things as good works, I speak of them in any light as meritorious. When I say that prayer, alms-deeds, fasting, and all the active fruits of a penitential spirit, are necessary to be done as satisfactions to God for my sins, I do not in the least mean that they *atone for my sin*. God forbid. They are satisfactions to God and myself, not in the light of merit or atonement, but solely in the light of the necessary demonstration of the fruits of a good tree. This is the doctrine of the Church, and this shall be my doctrine: “Works having a good end are called good works, and are so indeed: but yet that cometh not of themselves, but of the good where-

* For the way and time of doing alms-deeds, see chap. vi.

unto they are referred. On the other side, if the end that they serve unto be evil, it cannot then be otherwise but that they must needs be evil also. Of this sort of works is fasting, which of itself is a thing merely indifferent; but it is made better or worse by the end that it serveth unto. For, when it respecteth a good end, it is a good work; but, the end being evil, the work itself is also evil. To fast, then, [or to pray, or to communicate in the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, or to give alms, or to do any righteous thing] with the persuasion of mind that our fasting [or other good works] can make us perfect and just men, and finally bring us to heaven, is a devilish persuasion; and that fast [or other good work] is so far from pleasing of God, that it refuseth His mercy, and is altogether derogatory to the merits of Christ's death, and His precious blood-shedding.* Just so, again, in another place, I read in regard to alms-deeds:—

“But ye shall understand, dearly beloved, that neither those places of scripture before alleged, neither the doctrine of the blessed martyr Cyprian, neither any other godly and learned men, when they, in extolling the dignity, profit, fruit, and effect, of virtuous and liberal alms, do say that it washeth away sins, and bringeth us to the favour

* Homily. Sermon on Fasting.

of God, do mean that our work and charitable deed is the original cause of our acceptation with God—for that were indeed to deface Christ, and to defraud Him of His glory. But they mean this—that God of His mercy and special favour towards him whom he hath appointed to everlasting salvation, hath so offered His grace especially, and they have so received it fruitfully, that although by reason of their sinful living outwardly, they seemed before to have been the children of wrath and perdition, yet now the Spirit of God mightily working in them, unto obedience to God's will and commandments, they declare by their outward deeds and life in the shewing of mercy and charity (which cannot come but of the Spirit of God and His especial grace), that they are the undoubted children of God appointed to everlasting life—for as the good fruit is not the cause that the tree is good, but the tree must first be good before it can bring forth good fruit; so the good deeds of men are not the cause that maketh men good, but he is first made good by the Spirit and grace of God that effectually worketh in him, and afteryards he bringeth forth good fruits.”*

This, then, is the sense of my resolution to pursue my repentant spirit into penitential actions

* Homily on Alms-deeds.

—and this is the spirit with which I will strive henceforward to send up my prayers and alms-deeds, my fasting, and my holiness, with good Cornelius, as a memorial before God—“to submit myself unto God, and from henceforth walk in his ways; to take his easy yoke and light burden upon me, to follow him in lowliness, patience, and charity, and be ordered by the governance of His Holy Spirit; seeking always His glory, and serving Him duly in my vocation with thanksgiving: this if I do, Christ will deliver me from the curse of the law, and from the extreme malediction which shall light upon them that shall be set on the left hand; and He will set me on His right hand, and give me the gracious benediction of His Father, commanding me to take possession of His glorious kingdom: unto which may He vouchsafe to bring me, for His infinite mercy. Amen.”*

Miserere mei, Deus. Psalm LI.

Have mercy upon me, O God, after thy great goodness: according to the multitude of thy mercies do away mine offences.

Wash me thoroughly from my wickedness; and cleanse me from my sin.

* Commination Service.

For I acknowledge my faults: and my sin is ever before me.

Against thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified in thy saying, and clear when thou art judged.

Behold, I was shapen in wickedness: and in sin hath my mother conceived me.

But lo, thou requirest truth in the inward parts: and shalt make me to understand wisdom secretly.

Thou shalt purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.

Thou shalt make me hear of joy and gladness: that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice.

Turn thy face away from my sins: and put out all my misdeeds.

Make me a clean heart, O God: and renew a right spirit within me.

Cast me not away from thy presence: and take not thy Holy Spirit from me.

O give me the comfort of thy help again: and stablish me with thy free Spirit.

Then shall I teach thy ways unto the wicked: and sinners shall be converted unto thee.

Deliver me from blood-guiltiness, O God, thou

that art the God of my health: and my tongue shall sing of thy righteousness.

Thou shalt open my lips, O Lord: and my mouth shall shew thy praise.

For thou desirest no sacrifice, else would I give it thee: but thou delightest not in burnt-offerings.

The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit: a broken and contrite heart, O God, shalt thou not despise.

O be favourable and gracious unto Sion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem.

Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifice of righteousness, with the burnt-offerings and oblations: then shall they offer young bullocks upon thine altar.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was in the beginning, &c.

Lord have mercy upon me.

Christ have mercy upon me.

Lord have mercy upon me.

Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. Amen.

O Lord save thy servant.

That putteth his trust in thee.

Send unto me help from above.

And evermore mightily defend me.

Help me, O God my Saviour.

And for the glory of thy name deliver me: be merciful to me a sinner, for thy Name's sake.

O Lord hear my prayer.

And let my cry come unto thee.

O Lord, I beseech thee, mercifully hear my prayers, and spare me who now confess my sins unto thee; that I, whose conscience by sin is accused, by thy merciful pardon may be absolved; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

O most mighty God, and merciful Father, who hast compassion upon all men, and hatest nothing that thou hast made; who wouldest not the death of a sinner, but that he should rather turn from his sin, and be saved; mercifully forgive me my trespasses; receive and comfort me, who am grieved and wearied with the burden of my sins. Thy property is always to have mercy; to thee only it appertaineth to forgive sins. Spare me, therefore, good Lord, spare thy servant, whom thou hast redeemed; enter not into judgment with thy servant, who am vile earth, and a miserable sinner; but so turn thine anger from me, who meekly acknowledge my vileness, and truly repent me of my faults, and so make haste to help me in

this world, that I may ever live with thee in the world to come; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Turn thou me, O good Lord, and so shall I be turned. Be favourable, O Lord, be favourable to thy servant, who turns to thee in weeping, fasting, and praying. For thou art a merciful God, full of compassion, long-suffering, and of great pity. Thou sparest when we deserve punishment, and in thy wrath thinkest upon mercy. Spare thy servant, good Lord, spare me, and let not thine heritage be brought to confusion. Hear me, O Lord, for thy mercy is great, and after the multitude of thy mercies look upon me; through the merits and mediation of thy blessed Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

May the Lord bless me, and keep me: may the Lord lift up the light of his countenance upon me, and give me peace, now and for evermore. Amen.

MONDAY.

THE STATE OF MAN BY NATURE.

THE MEDITATION.

“ OF every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.”*

Thus spake the Almighty, then with no attribute but love; for nature was young, and pure, and spotless; and God saw every thing that it was good,† and man, the crowning work of all, knew of nought save to hold converse with God, and to talk with Him face to face, and to be ministered unto by angels and to rejoice in his exceeding great happiness, and life without end.

But it was not long; for the tempter drew nigh; and Satan, with his evil subtilty, beguiled the children of God, and they did eat:‡ and then God put on His attribute of justice, and the guilty and

* Gen. ii. 16, 17.

† Gen. i. 31.

‡ Gen. iii. 1.

disobedient children fell beneath the frowns of the Father's anger, and punishment was first decreed. Unto Adam God said: Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake: in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also, and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken. Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*

O fairest work of God, marred by this subtle enemy! O disobedient children towards so kind and loving a Father! Beauty turned into foulness, and order into deformity; happiness becoming misery; our children brought forth in sorrow, our ground accursed, and bringing forth thorns and thistles; and life, which was before eternal, now turned into certain death: for thus it was, that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men:"† for "in Adam all die;"‡ and thus it was that "all the days of man are sorrows, and his travail grief. His flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul

* Gen. iii. 17-19.

† Rom. v. 12.

‡ 1 Cor. xv. 22.

within him shall mourn:”* and thus it was that “man fleeth as a shadow, and continueth not in one stay;”† and “there is but one step between us and death.”‡

Thus speak the holy Scriptures. And when I look around, what is there for me to behold? Does not nature agree with Scripture? When I look at myself, what is there to see?—How frail in body, how weak in mind, how sensible of ill; how vain, how ignorant, how transitory!

My body.—True, indeed, “I am fearfully and wonderfully made. Thine eyes did see my substance yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all my members written, which in continuance were fashioned when as yet there was none of them:”§ but thou hast constructed me a perishable being. The wonderful fashion of these limbs, so perfect in their structure, so admirable for my existence, may yet be crumbled into dust, or be withered, or distorted, or by a thousand accidents may become a pain and grief to me. I look around me, and behold in my brethren the palsied limb and crippled body; I see on every side the tottering gait of the lame, the wandering step of the blind; I behold the deaf with their unconscious gaze, and the dumb, with their silent

* Eccl. ii. 23.

† Job xiv. 2.

‡ 1 Sam. xx. 3.

§ Ps. cxxxix. 14-16.

voice, and I cry out, O my God, what am I before thee!

My mind.—In this I am, indeed, better than the brute. Here, indeed, I may exult and glorify Thee that I can think, and reason, and hope, and anticipate what is to come, and weigh in the balance God's providence and love. But yet, what is even my mind by nature? "The thoughts of man are vanity."* "He laboureth in vain, he spendeth his strength for nought."† "If we apply our hearts to know wisdom, we shall perceive that this also is vexation of spirit; for in much wisdom is much grief, and he that increaseth knowledge, increaseth sorrow."‡

Thus speak the holy Scriptures. And when I look around—when I know that this mind, this bountiful gift of God, may be withdrawn at any moment, that it may wander, become diseased, like the body, and perish. When I behold the frenzy of the maniac, the simplicity of the idiot, the wandering gaze of the lunatic, I cry out again: What am I before thee, O God!

For these things may be mine. I also am one of that nature, one of that curse under which these things are sent; I also may be cast down by these withering maladies, and the noble dignity of my manhood be laid prostrate with

* Ps. xciv. 11.

† Isa. xlix 4.

‡ Eccles. viii. 16.

the brutes; I also may have to say to the horse and to the mule, thou art my brother; and the wisdom of the scribe, and the disputer of this world, may fall, under thy will, into the simplicity of the child, or the folly of the babbler.

And though we should escape these miseries,—yet how long? “What is our life? It is even a vapour that appeareth for a little while, and then vanisheth away.”* “There is no man that hath power over the spirit to retain the spirit; neither hath he power in the day of death.”† “One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh, and the memory of them that are dead is forgotten.”‡

Yea, it is even so. This fair body, now so goodly to look upon, though it shall escape all pains and diseases under which others are bowed down; this fair mind, though it shall be strong and vigorous for the years of its growth, yet must they put on the helpless guise of old age. Their beauty must decay; their strength is perfect weakness, and threescore years and ten will do their certain work.

Then comes the end. “Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?”§

* James iv. 14.

† Eccles. viii. 8.

‡ Eccles. i. 4.

§ Job. xiv. 10.

God has willed it so. By the curse of Adam we are bound, by the disobedience of our first parents we are punished.

Therefore, O my God, what am I before Thee?

Verily, we are altogether nothing :

“ We wait for light, but behold obscurity; for brightness, but we walk in darkness; we grope for the wall like the blind, we stumble as in the night.”*

THE REMEDY.

But yet: “ Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted within me? *Hope thou in God.*”†

“ Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee.”‡

“ Take no thought, saying, What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed—but seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness.”§

Thus speak the holy Scriptures: And why should I fear?

I behold the works of nature: I see beauty, and order, and providence, and love. I know that “ not a sparrow falleth to the ground with-

* Isaiah lix. 9.

† Ps. xlii. 5.
§ Matt. vi. 34.

‡ Ps. lv. 22.

out my heavenly Father, and that the very hairs of my head are all numbered;" and I will not fear, because I know that "I am of more value than many sparrows."*

What though I am a frail and perishable creature, yet God is able to do much; and I am God's child, and He is to me my Father. Then here is my remedy—here is my hope?

It is the almightiness of God which is the pillar of my hope: "Abba, Father, all things are possible to Thee."† Talk not how the seas may be turned into dry land, or the poor be raised up to be set with the princes of the people, or how stones can be made the children of Abraham, or how palsies and fevers can be cured with a word. I will stop all gaps of infidelity with this one bush. God is able. He that is made by no cause cannot be confined in His being; and He that hath no bounds in His being, can have no bounds to His power. There is no horizon under heaven or above heaven, that hope cannot look beyond it.‡ "Therefore, because in His hand are the issues of life and death, I will hope that He will guide me, and be my good shepherd. Under the shadow of His wings shall be my refuge, until calamities be overpast."§

* Matt. x. 29.

† Mark xiv. 36. ‡ Bishop Taylor.
§ Ps. lvii. 1.

It is the goodness of God which is also the pillar of my hope.

For mark the rain that falls from above, and the clouds which drop fatness, and the sun which gives his heat.

And all for man.

Mark the blessings with which He surrounds us: our food, our clothing, our dwellings, “our children, like olive branches round about our table.”*

And for all man.

Mark the fruits of the earth springing forth in never-ceasing bounty: “the grass growing for the cattle, and wine that maketh glad the heart of man; and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth his heart.”†

And all for man.

I may be frail, and poor, and needy, but the Lord “who careth for the ravens”‡ will also care for me,—I may be ignorant, but the Lord who giveth wisdom to the simple, will make me also wise unto salvation,—I may be subject to death, but I know what that death is: “The gate of everlasting life.” Therefore the Lord shall be my shepherd. In *this* world He shall feed me in a green pasture, and lead me forth beside the waters of comfort:—and for the *next* world,

* Ps. cxxviii. 3.

† Ps. civ. 14.

‡ Job xxxviii. 41.

though I shall have, by the course of nature, “to walk through the valley of the shadow of death, yet I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me, Thy rod and Thy staff shall comfort me.”*

THE PRAYER.

Almighty Father, who by Thy power and wisdom didst make the world, and all that therein is; who hast endued Thy humble servant and child with a nature frail and perishable, yet capable of everlasting glory, visit me, I beseech Thee, now, at this time, with Thy heavenly favour, counsel me with Thy heavenly wisdom, teach me with Thy heavenly grace.

Thou acceptest not the person of any man, but hast promised to hear the prayer of all such as come unto Thee faithfully. I pray Thee, therefore, hear my confession which I shall now from the secrets of my heart pour forth unto Thee. I pray Thee, guide with Thy spirit the thoughts of my prayer.

[Here confess unto God the impurities, foulness, and weaknesses of your nature, naming them individually as they occur to the mind.]

Then proceed.]

Therefore, O God, I am unworthy to stand before Thee. Thou seest me, how utterly un-

* Ps. xxiii. 1, 2, &c.

worthy of the least of all Thy mercies—how infirm of purpose, how weak in resolution.

I have been led from this to that; I have followed, even as my first parents, the subtilties of Satan; of the tree that Thou didst command, saying, “Thou shalt not eat,” even of that tree I have desired to eat, and have eaten, and am utterly cast down and ashamed to stand before Thy presence.

But, O God most righteous, O God most merciful, visit me not with Thine anger, send not Thy holy angels to drive me forth from Thy paradise, visit me not with that trouble and sorrow which for my disobedience I deserve; but let Thy holy angels pitch their tents round about, and dwell in my heart; send Thy Holy Spirit to sanctify that nature so foul in Thy sight, strengthen that which is weak, enlighten that which is dark, prevent and go before me, that henceforth I may be holy in Thy presence.

And now, O heavenly Father, as at this time, I pray more earnestly for Thy grace, I knock more urgently for Jesus Christ's sake; His death I soon shall commemorate; His blood, which cleanseth from all sin, I shall drink; His body, broken on the cross, I shall eat. Grant that I may do so with faith, with penitence, and with a true assurance of that love which passeth all

understanding. Grant that, as in Adam I am dead, so in Christ my Saviour I may be made alive; as in Adam I am driven forth from Thy presence in wrath, so in Christ my Saviour I may return to Thee in joy and salvation. Amen.

TUESDAY.

THE STATE OF MAN BY THE LAW.

THE MEDITATION.

“IT is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them.”*

I search the book of the law : I look towards Mount Sinai, and I there behold the Almighty clothed in all His attributes of terror.

“The people saw the thunderings and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking ; and when the people saw it, they removed and stood afar off ; and they said unto Moses, Speak thou with us, and we will hear, but let not God speak with us, lest we die.”† “Behold I set before you this day a blessing and a curse ; a blessing if ye obey the

* Gal. iii. 10. Deut. xxvii. 26.

† Exod. xx. 18.

commandments of the Lord your God, and a curse if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God.”*

Then dare I contemplate the severe exactness with which these holy precepts are commanded? Dare I contemplate the dreadful punishment with which their violation is charged? True, if I can attain them, my reward will be great; but if I fail, the punishment most dreadful, the wrath of God most terrible.

Then how do I stand before my God?

I know that He is holy. I know that He has delivered His will to me and all mankind, and that will is contained in the law. Unless the law had been delivered, I could not have disobeyed the law; and if I had not disobeyed the law, I had not known sin. “For I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died; and the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.”†

Then behold in what “jeopardy I stand every hour.”‡ Perfection demanded of me,—unlimited perfection; every thought, every word, every deed, such as shall not fear the examination, or shrink from the scrutiny of the all-seeing Searcher of hearts: and yet the ability to attain

* Deut. xi. 26.

† Rom. vii. 9.

‡ 1 Cor. xv. 30.

this perfection for ever absent, knowing that “the law is spiritual, but that I am carnal, sold under sin.”* “To will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. The good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do.”†

But let me pursue this.

My thoughts:—Have they been pure? have they been holy? Have they been such, that I can exclaim with any confidence to God, “Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts”?‡ Or have I not rather been one of those ungodly, who are so proud that they care not for God, neither “is God in all their thoughts”?§ My desires, the imaginations of my heart, have they been invariably towards God, or have they not rather been only “evil continually”?|| Have I done as the Apostle has bidden me, “casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ”?¶ Or, again, “Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if

* Rom. vii. 14.

§ Ps. x. 4.

† Rom. vii. 18.

|| Gen. vi. 5.

‡ Ps. cxxxix. 23.

¶ 2 Cor. x. 5.

there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, *think* on these things.”*

Have I done so? No! I would not even in thought be justified by the works of the law.

My words:—Have they been pure? Have they been temperate? Have they been holy? That noble gift of language, by which God has elevated man above the brute creation, how have I employed it? Too frequently have I forgotten His praise who gave it. Too frequently have my words been careless and inconsiderate, sometimes unchaste and foul, sometimes deceitful and blasphemous.

Yet what saith the will of God, “Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.”† “If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man’s religion is vain.”‡ “For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile.”§ But above all, our blessed Lord Himself has told me, “Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof at the day of judgment; for by thy words thou shalt be

* Phil. iv. 8.

† Eph. iv. 29.
§ Peter iii. 10.

‡ James i. 26.

justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.”*

How then shall I dare to be justified by the works of the law?

My actions:—Is my duty towards God in worship and praise—Is my duty towards man in charity, and doing to others as I would they should do to me—Is my duty to myself in temperance and chastity—Are these things so easy, so invariable, of such every day attainment, that I can contemplate any probable success, any likelihood of pleasing God? Have I “followed after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness?”† Have I stood in any one deed, “perfect and complete, in all the will of God”?‡ Have I “abhorred that which is evil, and cleaved to that which is good”?§ Alas! no!

Then when I cast my mind back upon these things, and when I silently meditate “in the night watches, and commune with mine own heart in my chamber, and am still,”|| with what fear and trembling, with what perplexity of thought, with what care of spirit, must I contemplate the chance of my soul’s salvation!

If it be true that “Our God is a consuming fire,”¶ for so says the *law*: If it be true that

* Matt. xii. 36.

§ Rom. xii. 9.

† 1 Tim. vi. 11.

|| Ps. lxxvii. 6.

‡ Col. iv. 12.

¶ Deut. iv. 24.

“The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ ;” and that “they shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord—”* for so says the *gospel*:—Wherein shall I stand?

When I dwell on these fearful things ; when I know the extreme penalty demanded, that God’s justice must be satisfied, that punishment must be suffered ; when I know that “whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in *one* point, he is guilty of *all*.”†

Then what is my state ?

Why am I created ? Why am I cast in this terrible condition, the heir of a curse most deadly ? “delighting in the law of God after the inward man, but seeing another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin.”‡ What shall I do ? whither shall I turn ?

How can I but exclaim : “O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death.”§

* 2 Thess. i. 7.

† James ii. 10.

‡ Rom. vii. 23.

§ Rom. vii. 24.

THE REMEDY.

“But why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted with me? *Hope thou in God.*”*

I know that “the law was given by Moses,” but I know also that “grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.”† I behold “Abraham who believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness;”‡ for “the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the *law*, but through the righteousness of *faith*.” “Therefore it is of faith, that it might be of grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.”§

Now, this promise of God to justify by faith, precedes the wrath of God, by which He threatens to condemn by the law; and surely “the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.”||

Then why did God give any law at all? Where was the necessity of God’s appearing a

* Ps. xlii. 5.

† John i. 17.

‡ Rom. iv. 3.

§ Rom. iv. 13.

|| Gal. iii. 17.

severe task-master, and an avenging magistrate, when all the time He meant to be to His children nothing but a merciful father? “Wherefore serveth the law?”

It was “our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ.”*

It was the way by which the Almighty wished to display to man the perfect holiness of His own nature, and the severity of that justice by which He would weigh their actions, standing by themselves. It was for Christ that the law was constituted. It was to Christ that everything pointed in its types, and its sacrifices, and its atonements. It was to JESUS that Adam, that Abraham, and that Moses looked.

Then shall my fear be turned into exceeding gladness. True, I am utterly unable to do the thing which God commands—but what of that? “Christ was made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that *we* might receive the adoption of sons.”† True that we dare not approach the Almighty with any sacrifices of our own; but then we have an high Priest, who is, instead of us, “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. True, we have the ordinances of the law to condemn us even unto death, but then there is One, who “has blotted out the handwriting of these ordinances, and taken it out of

* Gal. iii. 24.

† Gal. iv. 5.

‡ Heb. vii. 26.

the way, nailing it to his cross.”* “For there is, verily, a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof; for the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God.”†

Of these gracious assurances, these glorious hopes, the holy Scriptures are full. Then why need I fear?

Under the law, I feel the curse of God's wrath; but I will not abide under the law.

Under the gospel, I see the plenitude of God's mercy, and reconciliation, and love; and there shall be my hope.

When I look to Mount Sinai, I indeed behold thunderings, and lightnings, and all the terrible manifestations of an exacting lawgiver; but when I look to Mount Calvary, I behold the suffering, patient, merciful love, of an anxious and affectionate Father.

All my fear, then, is swallowed up in love, my anxiety ceases. My thoughts, undisturbed any longer by the dread alternative of absolute perfection, or utter condemnation, shall wing their joyful flight far away from the terrors of religion, to the sweet and consoling refreshments of mercy and peace.

While I remember that “the law entered that

* Col. ii. 14.

† Heb. vii. 18.

sin might abound," I know and feel that in my own heart, "where sin abounds, grace does much more abound."*

Yea, I will cry aloud with the apostle: "If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him freely give us all things?"

"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died."†

THE PRAYER.

O most mighty and eternal Lord God, who art terrible in Thy wrath, but yet in the midst of wrath thinkest of mercy; who art just in Thy judgments, and severe in Thy punishments, and yet wouldest not the death of a sinner, but that all should turn unto Thee and live. Look upon me, have mercy upon me; release me, O Lord my God, from the bonds of that law by which Thou hast brought the whole world under sin. Take away the terrors of Thy presence; remove the strictness of Thy justice.

I confess, O Lord, that if my thoughts, my words, my actions, were weighed in the balance

* Rom. v. 20.

† Rom. viii. 31.

of Thy holiness, they would be found miserably wanting. I confess that I deserve nothing at Thy hands but death.

I confess to Thee that I deserve to be cast out from Thy presence, to have my portion in that outer darkness, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth ; that I deserve to be extinct and separate from the communion of saints, and the comforts of religion, and the graces of Thy Holy Spirit, and the memory of my blessed Redeemer.

But yet I confess these things in the midst of hope, because I know Thy mercy ; I look to Thee in earnest supplication, because Thou hast promised to hear.

O my God, cast me not utterly away. Take not Thy Holy Spirit from me. Let the grace of the gospel comfort me when I think of the terrors of Thy law ; let that High Priest, who alone is perfect and blameless, offer in my place the atonement for my sinfulness. Take me back, O Lord my God, and consider mine infirmity. Redeem me from the curse of the law ; let the Holy Jesus be for me the propitiation of Thy wrath ; let the sprinkling of His blood be the remission of my sins.

I am not worthy to think of Thee with my unholy thoughts. I am not worthy to speak to Thee with my unclean lips : my words so evil,

my works so sinful, how can they stand in Thy sight? But yet, O Holy Spirit, come with Thy healing wings of comfort, and assure me. O Jesu Christ, my Redeemer, send, according to Thy promise, the Comforter, who shall bring all things to my remembrance. O Saviour and Lord, help Thou mine unbelief. Stablish, strengthen, bless me.

And when Thy holy sacrificial feast shall be ready, when I shall behold Thee more visibly and more intimately, as my High Priest offering *Thy body*, because God would not have the blood of *bulls and goats*; when I shall see the outward elements of bread and wine, O let me feel the inward faith, the strengthening and refreshing of my soul; when I behold the symbols of Thy love, let me be assured firmly and personally of that great redemption which that love has purchased. O let me feel that the curse has become a blessing; that death is changed into victory: that I am one of those happy ones: though guilty, yet accounted righteous; though sold under sin, yet redeemed by grace; though a child of wrath, yet now become an inheritor of Thy glorious kingdom.

O heavenly Father, hear the prayer of Thy humble servant; and when Thou hearest, forgive for Jesus' sake. Amen.

WEDNESDAY.

 THE SINS OF HABIT.

THE MEDITATION.

“CAN the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil.”*

But I, when I look back upon my past life, must at once acknowledge, not only as I before acknowledged the infirmities of my nature, and the dreadful penalties of the law, which attach to all men in their human condition generally;—but that I myself, in my own person, continually, habitually, day by day, have sinned against the Lord.

“O Lord, mine iniquities testify against me, my backslidings are many; I have sinned against Thee”!† “I am dead in trespasses and sins.”‡ I am a child of disobedience. “I have eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin;”§ an heart exercised with covetous practices. “I have

* Jer. xiii. 23. + Ib. xiv. 7. † Eph. ii. 1. § 2 Pet. ii. 14.

forsaken the right way, and am gone astray, following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness.”*

Let me commune with myself, and examine :

My principles,—what have they been? Of the world.

My rule of life,—what has it been? The opinion of men.

My treasure,—where has it been placed? On the earth.

They have taught me, men have taught me, the world has taught me, even from my youth up until now, that the demands and precepts of my Saviour and my God are unnecessary, beyond man's power, and unjust; and I too willingly have listened.

They have taught me, “ Why doth He yet find fault? for who has resisted His will? And I, the thing formed, have said to Him that formed me, why hast Thou made me thus?”†

They have taught me that the road which leadeth to heaven is broad and easy, while my Saviour has told me to “ enter the *strait* gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction; but *strait* is the gate and *narrow* is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.”‡

* 2 Pet. ii. 15.

† Rom. ix. 19.

‡ Matt. vii. 13.

They have taught me that the passions of my nature, and the lusts of the flesh, may be indulged without danger, and retained without offence; while I now find, that “if my right hand offend me, my duty is to cut it off, and cast it from me; for it is profitable for me that one of my members should perish, and not that my whole body should be cast into hell.”*

They have taught me that I can make a compromise with God, and barter and exchange a little good for a little evil; and that, should I offend to-day, I may repay that offence by an extra portion of obedience to-morrow: while I now find that when I “have done *all* these things which are commanded, I must still say, I am an unprofitable servant.”†

They have taught me, that though I may sin, I may yet escape. “Tush, God hath forgotten, He hideth away His face, and He will never see it.”‡ They have said that God is not so terrible, not so exacting, as He is described; that sin is not so sinful, that disobedience is not disobedient; whereas I now find, “Be sure your sin will find you out;”§ that the way of the wicked, the thoughts of the wicked, the sacrifice and prayer of the wicked, “are an abomination to the Lord.”|| “They have

* Matt. v. 30.

† Luke xvii. 10.

‡ Ps. x. 11.

§ Num. xxxii. 23.

|| Prov. xv. 9-26; xxviii. 9.

deceived me with vain words.”* “They have called good evil, and evil good; they have put darkness for light, and light for darkness; they have put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.”†

These are the things which they have taught me. These are the principles upon which I have lived. Here has been my treasure; here has been my heart.

I knew what God commanded, and the gospel taught. My sin was not from *ignorance*.

I knew the weakness of my nature, and the infirmities of my resolution. My sin was not from *inadvertence*.

I knew that God was good, but I thought the world was better.

But now, O my God, how am I cast down! Now I can sing and laugh no more. Now I can brave it out in pride no longer. Now I see and am convinced, before so blind, so wilful. Where was my understanding, when I played so boldly with the wrath of God; when God stood by, and yet I sinned; when conscience did rebuke me, and yet I sinned; when heaven and hell were hard at hand, and yet I sinned? When, to please God, and save my soul, I would not forbear a filthy lust, or give up a forbidden vanity? I am ashamed.

* Eph. v. 6.

† Isaiah v. 20.

I am confounded. "I loathe myself for all my abominations."*

I will search this out; they shall deceive me no longer.

What say the holy Scriptures?

"The works of the flesh are manifest: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like."†

Answer, O my soul, to these words of thy God. Between thee and Him; thee, the sinful and degraded; Him, the holy and the omniscient, thy sin lieth.

Wherewith shall I appear before God? I have been miserably deceived: "I have spoken peace where was no peace;"‡ I have gone on day by day, and year by year, deeper and deeper in iniquity, more and more alienate from God, my habits, my principles—what I have done, and what I have left undone—carnal, worldly, sensual.

"There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked."§

* Ezek. xxxvi. 31.

+ Gal. v. 19.

† Jer. vi. 14.

§ Isaiah lvii. 21.

THE REMEDY.

“But why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted within me? *Hope thou in God.*”*

But how can I hope in God, when I have so grievously offended Him? How can I approach the outraged purity of His presence? What can I do to deprecate the fierceness of His wrath?

“He that saith he hath not sinned, makes God a liar:”† but what then? Because a man *hath* sinned, it does not follow that he should do so *always*; for although it is impossible, humanly speaking, that the “Ethiopian can change his skin, or he that is accustomed to do evil learn to do good,”‡ yet “all things are possible with God.”§

Now behold the counsels of the Almighty: Jesus said to the impotent man: “*Sin no more*, lest a worse thing come unto thee.”|| Jesus said to the woman taken in adultery: “Neither do I condemn thee, go and *sin no more.*”¶ Nathan said unto David: “The Lord also hath *put away thy sin.*”**

“As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked

* Ps. xlii. 5.

† 1 John i. 10.

‡ Jer. xiii. 23.

§ Matt. xix. 26.

|| John v. 14.

¶ John viii. 11.

** 2 Sam. xii. 13.

should turn from his way and live ; for why will ye die, O house of Israel.”*

“ How shall I give thee up, Ephraim ? how shall I deliver thee, Israel ? how shall I make thee as Admah ? how shall I set thee as Zeboim ? I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim ; for I am God and not man.”† Truly, if He *were* man, my escape would be hopeless ; but He is God, He has not the passions and the feelings of man, and it is plain that His will is that none should perish, but that all should come to everlasting life.

Dwell upon this also. Consider how God has spared thee hitherto. And may He not spare thee altogether ?

In the midst of thy revellings, and surfeitings of the world, He might with one word have smitten thee to the dust. While thou wast saying to thy soul, “ Soul, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry,” God might have said to thee, “ Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee.”‡ But He spared thee, and led thee forth to green pastures ; and though thou lovedst the barren wilderness, He pleaded with thee face to face, He gave thee thy conscience, the holy Scriptures, His Son Jesus Christ, His Holy Spirit, and has called aloud to thee : “ Awake thou that sleepest, and

* Ezek. i. xxxiii. 11.

+ Hosea xi. 8.

‡ Luke xii. 19.

arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.”*

But there is more required for the remedy of thy fears than an admiration of God’s mercy, and for a justification of thy sins, than a retrospect of the past. Though God is merciful, yet is He just; and His justice is so severe, that He requires a satisfaction before it can be appeased. And can I give it? I cast about for something to appease Him. He *is* placable—He is *willing* to be appeased; but wherewithal shall I do it?

I cast about in vain. I cannot do it.

But there is one who can.

Behold once more the counsels of God. His counsel is, that ATONEMENT shall be made: “Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure, I shall make atonement for your sin.”† Thus spake Moses; and it is even so that Jesus Christ shall go up unto the Lord, and make atonement for *me*.

Jesus Christ “being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; yet He took upon Himself the form of a servant, and became obedient even unto death.”‡

Nor was that all.

Having lived a life of holiness, he died a death

* Eph. v. 14.

† Exod. xxxii. 30.

‡ Phil. ii. 6.

of SACRIFICE, and “Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us.”*

Nor was that all.

Being sacrificed for us, and dying the death of the cross, He rose again, and ascended on high ; and “ when He had Himself purged our sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high,”† and there He still sits, our MEDIATOR, and our INTERCESSOR ; thence He sends the COMFORTER ; thence He views the sufferings, the trials, the struggles, even of me, His sinful creature.

“ Without shedding of blood there is no remission.”‡ But there *is* a shedding of blood ; and JESUS made it.

Without an atonement, we cannot satisfy justice ; but there is an atonement, and JESUS made it.

Without some intercession of a more worthy advocate than man, between ourselves and God, there is no hope that God will hear. But there *is* an intercession, and JESUS, at the right hand of God, for ever makes it.

Then, “ awake, O my soul, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.”§

“ Is there no balm in Gilead ; is there no physician there ?”|| Turn to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and answer : look to the blood of the Saviour, and

* 1 Cor, v. 7.

† Heb. i. 3.

‡ Heb. ix. 22.

§ Eph. v. 14.

|| Jerem. viii. 22.

answer. Thou hast sinned against God; thou hast sinned from habit; thou hast sinned against conscience, against reason, against the Scriptures, until, O my soul, thou art an abomination before the Lord.

But yet,—the Lord is merciful. Believest thou the gospel? “I know that thou believest.”* Be not then *almost* persuaded to be a Christian, but entirely so. Give thyself up to repentance; prostrate on thy knees “pray without ceasing;”† pray for the Spirit; pray for mercy; pray for sanctifying grace.

O yes, even yet I will be glad and rejoice. My Saviour is my “strong rock for an house of defence, and my fortress.”‡ “Bring hither the ring, and kill the fatted calf;” for while I am now saying, “Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son;” lo, I hear my Father’s voice, the kind, the forgiving, “My son was dead, and is alive again; was lost, and is found.”§

THE PRAYER.

O Thou, who sittest at the right hand of God, in Thine eternal glory, Jesu Christ, my Mediator and my Redeemer, hear the voice of my supplication; give ear unto the words of my prayer.

* Acts xxvi. 27.

† 1 Thess. v. 17.

‡ Ps. xxxi. 2.

§ Luke xv. 32.

My sins are so grievous, that I cannot endure them; mine iniquities are so heavy, that they press me to the dust: I cannot look up for shame, I am cast down, I am utterly discomfited.

But, O Lord most mighty, O God most merciful, O Jesu Christ most righteous, cast me not utterly from Thy presence, and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me.

I have been deceived and cruelly mocked; I have loved the world, and despised righteousness; I have set up Dagon in my heart, and wilfully thrown down the ark of the Almighty. My name is Legion, for the sins that beset me are beyond number. The one evil spirit is gone, but seven others, more wicked than the first, have entered in to dwell there, and my last state is worse than the first.

But, O Lord most mighty, O God most merciful, O Jesu Christ most righteous, cast me not utterly from Thy presence, and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me.

O my Father, let me pour forth my voice in confession, let me lay bare my heart before Thee.

My open sins, my secret sins, my presumptuous sins; sins that I noted not, that I willingly neglected, that I acted in wilful ignorance and voluntary blindness, sins which a diligent spirit might have prevented, but I would not—How manifold they are!

[Here confess them, naming them individually, and detailing their circumstances.]

But Thou, O Lord, my Saviour, hast shed Thy blood for the sins of the whole world. Thou enduredst the cross, despising the shame. Thou didst arise from the dead a glorified body; Thou didst ascend, and lead captivity captive; Thou sittest at the right hand of God, to mediate and to intercede. Through Thee let me come before the Father; by Thy blood of atonement suffer me to be cleansed; O quicken me according to Thy word!

Lead me, O blessed Lord, to that sacred altar, the altar of Thy memorial; there suffer me to feed on Thy holy mysteries of love. Too long have I neglected Thy holy feast; too long have I despised Thy means of grace; too long have I forfeited my hopes of glory: but now no longer. Only do Thou, who seest that I have no power of myself to help myself, be my guide, my propitiation, my advocate; so strengthen me by faith, so sanctify me by grace, that henceforward I may take up my cross and follow Thee—that when I shall be cleansed from the past, I may be strengthened for the future, that I may grow in grace more and more, that I may cast away the evil principles of the world, the degradation of sin, the foulness of the flesh; that I may be transformed in the renewing of my mind, and put off the old man;—so that

from the hour in which I shall by Thy goodness partake of Thy body and Thy blood, I may taste of comfort, and joy, and hope ;—so that when this perishable world shall have passed away, this corruption shall have put on incorruption, this mortality shall have put on immortality, I, though unworthy, though weak, though disobedient, may yet sit down at the Supper of the Lamb, my soul redeemed, my sins forgiven.

O holy Father, hear my voice, for the sake of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, my Lord. Amen.

THURSDAY.

SINS OF TEMPTATION.

THE MEDITATION.

“LET him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.”*

The sinfulness of nature may, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, and the blood of Jesus Christ, be washed out; evil habits, evil principles, may have been avoided, and the knowledge of God’s law may have worked in my heart a generally righteous life, so that I may look around me and say, “Judge me, O Lord, for I have walked in mine integrity.”† With the young man in the gospel, I may say, “All these things have I kept from my youth up, what lack I yet?”‡

But, O my soul, darest thou thus commune with the Lord? Supposing that thou couldest hope to be called, with righteous David, a man

* 1 Cor. x. 12.

† Ps. xxvi. 1.

‡ Matt. xix. 20.

after God's own heart ; yet hast thou had no moments of weakness, no losses from thy state of purity, no deviations in the hour of temptation from that holiness which God loves ?

Cast back thy mind upon the days that are past. The Scripture tells me to "be sober, be vigilant, because my adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour."* S. Paul says, "I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity of the gospel."† My Saviour tells me that the seed is very often "sown among thorns ;" and though it presents a good appearance for a time, yet the "cares of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things enter in, and choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful."‡ And again, He most solemnly warns me to "watch and pray lest I enter into temptation ; for the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."§

Am I then superior to all this ? Do I stand in no need of this warning ? Have I done, without intermission, the will of my heavenly Father ? Has the enemy never surprised me ? Has no ac-

* 1 Pet. v. 8.

† 2 Cor. xi. 3.

‡ Matt. xiii. 22.

§ Matt. xxvi. 41.

cident ruffled the even tenor of my righteousness? Have I walked so invariably in the regions of the Spirit, as to be beyond all influence of the things of the flesh; armed in the breastplate of faith so completely, as to leave no naked spot which the arrows of the evil one might pierce? Have I held no parley with the tempter? Have I had no doubts, no misgivings, no covetous desires, no forbidden longings?

O boast not thyself, but remember—

The holy David* gazed from the towers of his house upon the wife of Uriah; and because she was beautiful to look upon, he was tempted, holy and righteous as was his general character, by that forbidden and accidental gaze, to forget all his former righteousness. Blind and infatuated, the tempter led him at his will from the sin of thought to the sin of action, until he became an adulterer, a traitor, and a murderer.

Have *I* never, with unholy gaze, forgotten the resolutions of my purity? If not in action, yet in will? Pure and good as I seem, have I never failed; have I never yielded to the “lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life?”† O let me remember that “when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin.”‡ That “who-

* 2 Sam. xi. 2.

† 1 John ii. 16.

‡ James i. 15.

soever looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery already with her in his heart.”*

Achan,† of the tribe of Judah, beheld the spoil of the enemy, the silver and gold, and the Babylonish vest, and he could not withstand the desire of his heart: but the tempter led him from the sight to the action—and, against the commandment of the Lord, he took the accursed thing.

Have *I* never set my heart on forbidden treasures? Has the sight of silver and gold, the riches and the splendour, the fair dwellings and the mighty possessions of my brethren, stirred up no feelings of envy? If they have not provoked to violence or to stealth, yet have I not coveted? Can I safely say with the apostle Paul, “I have coveted no man’s silver, or gold, or apparel”?‡ O let me remember the commandments of my God; “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife, nor his ox, nor his ass, *nor any thing that is his.*”§

S. Peter, the confident, the bold, did his confidence endure? We have seen him stretching forth to walk upon the sea,|| and yet sinking. We have seen him crying aloud, “Thou art the

* Matt. v. 28. † Joshua vii. 21. ‡ Acts xx. 33.
§ Exod. xx. 17. || Matt. xiv. 30.

Christ, the Son of the living God :”* and yet, in the time of adversity, in spite of all his boasting, he began to curse and swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak.”†

Have *I* never been tempted, amid the scoffs of the unbeliever, and the ridicule of the sceptic, to deny my Lord and Master? Was there no moment when bodily danger, or worldly favour, the applause of the wicked, or the friendship of the world, have induced me to forego the love and approbation of my God, and to say of my blessed Redeemer and Lord, “I know not this man of whom ye speak”?

O let me remember that if I cannot give up houses, and lands, and children, and wife, yea, and life also, for the kingdom of God, I cannot be Christ’s disciple.‡

Then, O my soul, how great are thy temptations. How manifold the falls of him who thinketh he standeth. Thou canst turn neither to the right nor to the left; thou canst look nowhere, touch nothing, hear nothing, taste nothing, but that the subtle enemy shall be disguised beneath it, lying in wait for thy peril. The senses, the intellect, thy social duties, thy religious duties; hearing the word, preaching the word—even that which puts on the semblance of

* Matt. xvi. 16.

† Mark xiv. 71.

‡ Luke xiv. 26, 33.

good,—yet shall hide beneath it a danger. Even that which shall seem to men laudable and righteous, yet shall carry a sting beneath its external beauty, filled with the venom of the evil one.

Then boast not thyself; but remember the many occasions of sin to which thou hast yielded; the snares of the enemy into which thou hast fallen. Trust not in thyself that thou art righteous above other men, but be like that humble publican, who smote upon his breast, saying, “God be merciful to me a sinner.”* Thou mayest be even a man after God’s own heart, like David, yet some accident may have overcome thee; and like David, thou hast fallen. One only was tempted like as we are, and yet without sin—and that one was the Lord our Righteousness. One only did resist the devil, and he fled—and that was the Anointed of the Lord.

Then I will get me to my Lord right humbly. I am a poor, weak, deceived creature. I cannot do the thing that I would. “I will acknowledge my transgression, and my sin shall be ever before me. Against Thee, Thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight, that Thou mightest be justified when Thou speakest, and be clear when Thou judgest.”†

* Luke xviii. 13.

† Psalm li. 4.

THE REMEDY.

“But why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted within me? *Hope thou in God.*”*

True that I am surrounded by many dangers, that I cannot look, cannot speak, cannot think, without the great enemy of souls at hand to turn the good which God intended into evil; but have I not as great and certain helps, as I have fearful and treacherous enemies?

I have the *example* of the righteous—I behold Abraham.

“It came to pass that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and offer him for a burnt-offering.”† And faithful Abraham was proof against this heavy trial, and his obedience gave not way: “My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering,” and he went forth, and Satan, standing by in expectation of his victory, saw, for once, man triumphant; and the Lord said: “Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me.”

I behold Job.

Satan answered the Lord and said: “Doth Job fear God for nought? put forth thine hand and

* Psalm xliii. 5.

† Gen. xxii. 1.

touch all that he hath, and he will curse Thee to Thy face.”* And He did so. The Sabeans slew his oxen, the fire fell upon his sheep, the Chaldeans fell upon his camels, the house fell upon his young men ; yet what did Job ? Satan stood by, and whispered in his ear : “ Curse the Lord, yea even curse the Lord who has sent thee this misery ;” but patient Job despised the tempter, he fell down, and worshipped, saying : “ Naked came I out of my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return thither. The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord.”† And even this was not all. Satan said unto the Lord : “ Put forth Thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse Thee to Thy face.”‡ So Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord, and smote Job with sore boils, and he took him a potsherd to scrape himself withal, and he sat down among the ashes. And “ his wife said unto him, Dost thou still retain thy integrity ? curse God and die.”§

O let me dwell upon the severity of this temptation, his substance gone, his oxen, his sheep, his children, and now a sore disease, and last of all his wife, yea even the wife of his bosom, even she becomes a vehicle of Satan’s power ;—even

* Job i. 9. † Job i. 21. ‡ Job ii. 5-9. § Job ii. 5-9.

she, the wife of his bosom, she counsels him to curse God. But patient Job triumphs, he holdeth fast his integrity, Satan is repelled; crest-fallen and vanquished, he finds that there *is* a power to withstand him. And Job said: "What! shall we receive good at the hand of God, and not receive evil?"*

But above all, I behold my great Redeemer: "Jesus was led up of the Spirit to be tempted of the devil."† Thrice the tempter assailed Him, but thrice was he beaten back. First, the temptation of the senses: "Command that these stones be made bread." Again, the temptation of vain-glory: "If Thou be the Son of God, cast Thyself down." Again, the temptation of worldly power: "All this will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me." But it moved not the holy Jesus. He was tempted like as we are; He had like passions, like feelings; here were allurements to Him, which presented all the aspect of present delight. But He failed not. O dwell upon that wonderful scene, dwell upon the Lord in this example which He furnishes to thee, even thee, in the daily solicitations which Satan urges, so skilfully, so fatally—and remember, O my soul, that it was the word of God that saved Him: "It is written," "it is

* Job ii. 10.

† Matt. iv. 1.

written," "it is written."* And in this He swerved not, in this He beat thee down, in this He saw through thy devices, O thou enemy of souls.

But some did not prove victorious, some did fail in the hour of trial, even as I have done. Well, but there was a way of restoration. They were not finally destroyed.

David failed: But God sent the prophet Nathan to him. He was asleep and blind in his sin until the prophet spake; but when once awakened, once seeing the light again, he said unto Nathan: "I have sinned against the Lord,"† and then,—O gracious mercy, so prompt, so ready for sinful man! Nathan said unto David: "The Lord also hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die."

Peter failed: He was bound to Satan: "The Lord said, Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."‡ It was foreseen that he should fail, but the Lord was praying for him. Satan was sifting him as wheat, but the Lord was asking for his restoration at that very moment. And his faith, though it failed, did not fail *entirely*; and no

* Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10. † 2 Sam. xii. 13. ‡ Luke xxii. 31.

sooner, in the infatuation of that singular denial, thrice repeated in the face of warning, in the very presence of the Lord, no sooner was it done, than the mist which clouded his vision dispersed, and “he wept bitterly.”*

So let me weep bitterly, so let the Lord pray also for *me*, intercede also for *me*, when Satan sifts me as wheat. O shall I not have comfort in this; “shall I say when I am tempted, I am tempted of God.”† Nay, but when I know the mercy, the love and the power of God, I shall feel sure that “no temptation can take me, but such as is common to man, and that God is faithful, and will not suffer me to be tempted above that I am able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape that I may be able to bear it.”‡

Then gird thyself and “fight the good fight of faith:”§ “Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men.”|| “Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing.”¶ I know that in myself I am utterly powerless, and that, if I succeed, it is “not I but the grace of God that is with me.”** I dare not so much as lift up my eyes to the allurements of my enemy ;

* Matt. xxvi. 75.

§ 1 Tim. vi. 12.

+ James i. 13.

|| Prov. iv. 14.

** 1 Cor. xv. 10.

† 1 Cor. x. 13.

¶ 2 Cor. vi. 17.

but the Spirit is ever ready to them that ask, and I will ask. It is "Faith that is the victory which shall overcome the world,"* and therefore I will go to Jesus Christ my Saviour; and when I go to Him, He tells me, "*watch and pray*, lest ye enter into temptation." I will therefore "watch and pray."†

For the past, though many are my falls, yet now "I weep bitterly."‡

For the future, though I know that "I wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places;"§ yet I will "put on the whole armour of God, that I may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

"And I will stand, having my loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness.

"And my feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace.

"Above all, I will take the shield of faith, wherewith I shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

"And I will take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God:"||

* 1 John v. 4. ‡ Matt. xxvi. 41. † Matt. xxvi. 75.
§ Ephes. vi. 12. || Ephes. vi. 11-17.

THE PRAYER.

O Almighty and eternal God, whose paths are mercy and truth; who dost not willingly afflict the children of men, nor try them beyond that which they are able to bear; hear me yet once more, O Thou most mighty, and let the voice of my petition come before Thy presence.

Innumerable evils have compassed me round about. My temptations are more in number than the hairs of my head. O Lord, whither shall I turn?

Thou hast led me to the mountain to be tempted of the devil. Thou hast suffered Satan to walk to and fro upon the earth: Thou hast given him power to try me, even as silver is tried. O Lord, I have not fought the good fight of faith. I have failed in the hour of need. I have been discomfited; and though I thought myself strong, yet was mine enemy too powerful, his devices exceeding treacherous.

The lusts of the flesh came before me, and I fell.

[Here recount and dwell upon the instances.]

The lusts of the eye came before me, and I fell.

[Here recount and dwell upon the instances.]

The pride of life came before me, and I fell.

[Here recount and dwell upon the instances.]

But Thou art He who said, I came not to call

the righteous, but sinners to repentance. Thou art He who described Thyself as glad when the prodigal returned; as rejoicing when the lost sheep was found. Thou art He who said, There is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance. Thou art He who didst not reject the penitent Magdalen. Thou art He who didst not cast aside Thy weeping Apostle, even though he denied Thee thrice.

Therefore will I hope in Thy mercy for the past. Therefore, O my God, I pray to Thee more diligently for strength for the future. I ask for Thy Holy Spirit more earnestly, and for faith, and for hope, and for grace, that I may bring my body under subjection, and make my mind quiet even as a weaned child, and remember that of myself I can do no good thing.

With Adam I have fallen before the subtilty of the serpent. But grant, O Lord my Saviour, that with Thee I may henceforward cry aloud, Get thee hence, Satan; and then let angels come and minister. O give me the spirit of Abraham to believe, of Job to endure, of John to love, of David to repent.

O blessed Saviour, that promised the Comforter, leave me not comfortless.

O Holy Spirit, shed Thy divine influence on my heart, to prevent me, so that I may not fall into

temptation; but if I *do* fall into temptation, then, make a way for me to escape, that I may be able to bear it, and glorify Thy name.

Defend me against all delusions. Sanctify me in all my trials. Let not worldly knowledge mislead me, or reason make me proud. Let not prejudice make me obstinate, or interest make me blind. Let Thy gracious promises quicken my obedience, Thy fearful judgments deter me from forgetfulness. Give me a full persuasion of the blessed truths of Thy gospel, a full faith in my Saviour Jesus Christ, a certain knowledge that He, and that He alone, is the way, the truth, and the life.

And above all, grant, of Thine infinite goodness, that now, as Thy holy feast, O Jesu Christ, draws near, I may more intimately dwell upon Thee, more dearly love Thee; that while I receive from Thy blessed Body and Blood in the Holy Supper more close assurance of Thy pardon, I may also have more earnest confidence in Thy support, so that each time I partake of these holy mysteries, I may grow in grace more and more, until, passing through the valley of the shadow of death, I may come to those blessed mansions of eternal glory which Thou hast prepared for them that love Thee. Hear my prayer, O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world. Hear my prayer, O merciful God, for His sake, whose servant I am, my Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

FRIDAY.

THE GRACES OF THE GOSPEL.

THE MEDITATION.

“ If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His.”*

Then, must I do something more than I have yet done, if I would be of the fold of that “ good Shepherd, who giveth His life for the sheep.”† I must do more in my examination of the past, than merely look to deficiencies ; I must not only look in repentance to the failures of the past, but I must advance, and make daily progress in the future, and lift up my soul to God in all the graces of the gospel, in all the fruits of the Spirit, in the *humility*, in the *purity*, in the *charity*, which constitute the

SPIRIT OF CHRIST.

Then let me consider—

If I possess justice, fortitude, temperance, will

* Romans viii. 9.

† John x. 11.

that constitute the spirit of Christ? These things are certainly demanded by God, but they are duties which the heathen might learn as well as the Christian; they are attainable by human reason, and are, therefore, not the distinctive marks of the spirit of Christ.* But it was

I. THE SPIRIT OF HUMILITY.

Can I behold Christ, my Saviour, fellow-partaker with me, frail and perishable as I am, yet fellow-partaker with me of human nature, degraded to my level, “who am but dust and ashes,”† and yet not see how conspicuously marked in the spirit of Christ is—*the spirit of humility!*

He was poor and unknown, a labouring mechanic, without favour, without reputation:‡ “He being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God—but yet He made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.”§

How did He teach?—“When thou art bidden of any man to a wedding, go, and sit down in the lowest room.”|| “Except ye become as little

* Rom. ii. 14, 15.

† Gen. xviii. 27.

‡ Mark vi. 3.

§ Phil. ii. 6.

|| Luke xiv. 10.

children, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.”* “Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart.”†

Who were His companions?—Not the noble and the great; not the wise lawyer and the subtle pharisee: but He was “the friend of publicans and sinners.”‡ He conversed with the outcast and the despised; no sinner, however degraded, but met with kind words from Him; no misery, however abject; no sickness, however loathsome; but He was at hand, to comfort and to heal.

How did He act?—When the disciples contended which of them should be the greatest, “He took a child, and set him in the midst.”§

When they were contending for precedency, “He took a towel, and girded Himself, and washed His disciples’ feet.”||

Then, O my soul, wilt thou not be lowly and meek, even as Christ was lowly and meek? Dost thou desire to be rich and noble? Wilt thou invent endless distinctions of rank, and struggle for high places, and “be called of men, Rabbi”?¶ O, surely, not.

Thou wilt banish all haughty words and proud thoughts. Thou wilt not exact too much of those who serve in the lowest places of the world, be-

* Matt. xviii. 3.

† Matt. xi. 29.

‡ Luke vii. 34.

§ Matt. xviii. 2.

|| John xiii. 14.

¶ Matt. xxiii. 7.

cause thou wilt remember that thou “also hast a Master in heaven.”* Thou wilt remember, that “blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.”† Thou wilt take a towel, and gird thyself, and wash thy servants’ feet; knowing that thou art equal—equal in sin, equal in infirmity, equal in need of redemption by another’s merits—even with the lowest, the vilest, the most abject, of thy brethren.

II. THE SPIRIT OF PURITY.

Even His enemies acknowledged this. The wife of Pilate called Him “that just man.”‡ Pilate said of Him, “Why, what evil hath He done?”§ Even Satan himself announced Him, speaking in the unclean spirit: “I know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God.”||

And not only in action. The purity of Christ went far deeper. He said: “Blessed are the pure in *heart*.”¶ “Out of the *heart* proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.”**

Then, not only must I keep my *body* pure, and my *hands* clean, but even my mind. I must be pure, even in *intention*.

* Ephes. vi. 9.

† Matt. v. 3.

‡ Matt. xxvii. 19.

§ Luke xxiii. 22.

|| Luke iv. 34.

¶ Matt. v. 8.

** Mark vii. 21.

Now, let me consider :

If I am pure in outward appearance ; if I *speak* well of religion, have God in my *mouth*, and to all external observation abstain from all gross violations of right, shall I have the spirit of Christ ? O no. I shall be only pure for man's sake, and not for God ; for fear, and not for righteousness. There may be outward mortification, the robe of sackcloth, and the sprinkling of ashes, while the soul shall be as foul as leprosy. There may be clean hands and chaste words, but withal lustful imaginations and intemperate desires.

But, O my God, my Saviour, am I likely to deceive Thee in this ? Can I cover the impurity of my thoughts from Thy all-searching eye ? Thou desirest to present Thy Church “ without wrinkle and without spot, or any such thing ; ”* and, therefore, I, as one of this Church, must be without wrinkle and without spot.

If I shall only hear God when he speaks His decided prohibitions in the loud thunders of Mount Sinai—then I shall be a very good pharisee, but surely a very poor Christian. If I swear not, steal not, commit no adultery, shall I then clap my hands, and say—See how I obey God ? That may be very well for a disciple of the law, but not for a disciple of the pure and holy Jesus.

* Ephes. v. 27.

There is no "Thou shalt not," and "Thou shalt," in the spirit of Christ. There is no limit to His all-pervading holiness. In the heart, in the motive, in the intention, I must be pure, "even as Christ is pure."*

"I must wash my hands," and also my thoughts, "in innocency, and so will I compass Thine altar."†

III. THE SPIRIT OF CHARITY.

If I give alms—Is that the charity of Christ? What saith the holy Scripture?

"Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing."‡ Then I may give alms, and yet have no charity. Yes, because, as before, it is a business of the motive, not of the deed.

What saith the holy Scripture again?

"Charity suffereth long, and is kind. Charity envieth not. Charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."§

Now see the spirit of Christ.

When the tower in Siloam fell, and slew eighteen men, Jesus said: "Think ye that they

* 1 John iii. 3.

† Ps. xxvi. 6.

‡ 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

§ 1 Cor. xiii. 4.

were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, nay.”* When the woman taken in adultery was brought before Him, and the scribes and pharisees were unable in their consciences, when tested by Jesus, to pursue the accusation, the reply was, passing by the crime by writing with his finger on the ground for charity’s sake, “Neither do I condemn thee. Go and sin no more.”†

His patience under sufferings.

“When He was reviled, He reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not, but committed Himself unto Him that judgeth righteously.”‡

His readiness to forgive injuries.

“Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.”§

But, O my soul, hast thou this spirit? Thou must endeavour after it, if thou wouldest be one of Christ’s.

Thy judgment must think no evil.

Thy forgiveness must banish all memory of wrongs.

Thy patience must bear all things, hope all things, believe all things, for Jesus’ sake.

* Luke xviii. 4, 5.

† John viii. 11.

‡ 1 Pet. ii. 23.

§ Luke xxiii. 34.

THE MEANS.

How then shall I acquire these great excellencies? How shall I presume? how shall I attempt to follow the steps of my Saviour, “who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth?”*

“Even by ruling myself according to Thy word.”†

1. To be humble.

If I am rich; if my silver and gold is multiplied:‡ then I must remember that I am only the more dangerously situated by those very riches, because “it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.”§ I must remember that when Lazarus died, he was carried to Abraham’s bosom: and that when Dives died, he in the place of torment lifted up his voice, even for a drop of water to cool his parched tongue.||

If I am high born, I must remember that this is purely a distinction invented by man, and that God can “of these stones raise up children unto Abraham.”¶

If I have beauty. The very flowers have

* 1 Pet. ii. 22.

† Ps. cxix. 9.

‡ Deut. vii. 13.

§ Luke xviii. 25.

|| Luke xvi. 24.

¶ Matt. iii. 9.

much more beauty, and they are blooming one day, and cut down and cast into the oven the next; and a fever, or a blast of the cold wind, or the falling shower, may mar all my beauty in a moment. "O God, Thou makest my beauty consume away, even like a moth fretting a garment."^{*}

If I have power. If I say with Nebuchadnezzar, "Is not this great Babylon that I have built?"[†] yea, even while the word is in my mouth, I may be driven from men, and eat grass as oxen, and my body may be wet with the dew of heaven.

If I have spiritual zeal. Then let me remember that the self-righteous pharisee was not justified so much as the lowly publican,[‡] and that the apostle Paul feared that he might be a cast-away,[§] and called himself the chief of sinners."^{||}

These remembrances will make thee bow before the Lord, and get thyself to thy God right humbly.

II. To be pure.

Remember the integral purity of God. That no man can stand in His presence and live; so

* Ps. xxxix. 11.

† Dan. iv. 30.

‡ Luke xviii. 14.

§ 1 Cor. ix. 27.

|| 1 Tim. i. 25.

bright the effulgence of His glory, so pure the holiness of His mind; and yet thou must be “perfect, even as He is perfect.”*

Remember that to make thee pure, the blood of that very God, who became man for the purpose, was shed upon the cross.

Remember that thy body is the “temple of the Holy Ghost,”† and thou oughtest not to mar God’s building—a building which he has thought worthy of His own especial presence, and into which He has sent His Spirit to dwell there.

Remember that thou put not thyself into any wilful condition of danger, indulging in impure sights, in wanton conversation, in unholy company, where deeds of darkness may be done, or words of darkness may be spoken.

These things, if thou wilt remember, thou wilt purify thyself even as Christ is pure.‡

III. To be charitable.

Consider “not only thine own things, but the things of others;”§ “rejoicing with those that do rejoice, and weeping with those that do weep;”|| “if thou hast two coats, giving one to him that hath none,”¶ and imparting of thine abundance to him that lacketh.

* Matt. v. 48.

† 1 Cor. vi. 19.

‡ 1 John iii. 3.

§ Philip. ii. 4.

|| Rom. xii. 15.

¶ Luke iii. 11.

Consider the proverb, “Physician, heal thyself,”* and the saying, that “every one must bear his own burden;”† and “look not to the mote in thy brother’s eye before thou hast removed the beam in thine own eye.”‡

Consider that “by what measure thou metest it shall be measured to thee again; and that as thou judgest thy brother here, so wilt thou be judged hereafter.”§

Consider that the great day will come when the congregated nations of the world shall be assembled, and the books open, in which the things done in the flesh are written; “and the dead shall be judged out of those things which are written in the books according to their works.”|| O look to thyself, and not to others.

Consider how great that love was which Christ has borne to thee.

Consider His life, His death, His resurrection.

Consider that this love is now being exerted for thee, and will continue to be exerted for thee as long as He sits at the right hand of God the Father, “seeing that He ever liveth to make intercession;”¶ and that, if thou sayest “thou lovest God and hatest thy brother, thou art a liar.”**

* Luke iv. 23.

† Gal. vi. 5.

‡ Matt. vii. 2.

§ Matt. vi. 2.

|| Rev. xx. 12.

¶ Heb. vii. 25.

** 1 John iv. 20.

Consider these things, and then unkindness, and envy, and malice, and littleness of mind, and all uncharitableness, must at once and for ever vanish. Thou wilt have the Spirit of Christ.

THE PRAYER.

O Jesu Christ, most pure, most holy, whose innocent spirit blessed and dignified the form of man, whose heart knew no evil, and lips no guile, Thy servant, even I, Thine unworthy servant, would fain receive from Thee a ray of that heavenly brightness, the faintest beam of light, from Thee, the Sun of righteousness.

Blessed Lord, let all pride of nature be banished from my heart, when I think of Thee, the lowly and the meek. Thou wast rich, but became poor for my sake. Thou wast God, and became a man for my sake. Thou wast the anointed king, but became a servant for my sake.—Let all vanity and self-opinion, presumptuous thoughts, and spiritual ambition, be utterly cast from my soul; for Thou delightest not to be called Rabbi, and Thou didst say, “Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God.”

Suffer not the pollutions of the flesh, and the foul imaginations of the mind, to degrade that temple which was chosen for Thy dwelling-place. Suffer not wild and impatient desires to perplex my

thoughts ; irregular passions to disturb my love ; unholy words to pollute the free spirit by which Thou didst make me Thine own.

Grant also, O Thou most kind to the failings of man, loving where Thou mightest have turned away in hate, and rewarding where Thou mightest most justly have punished—grant that, as I am severe towards myself, I may be charitable towards others. That I may think no evil, and speak no evil ; that I may love as I hope to be loved, forgive as I hope to be forgiven ; where misfortune presses, that I may have power to comfort ; where poverty has laid low, that I may have the ability to help ; where sin has overcome, that I may have the grace to counsel and to guide.

For this purpose, O heavenly Father, let Thy Holy Spirit shed over my soul that ineffable unction of sincerity, of integrity, of righteous principle, which is alone Thy gift ; that I may be Thy son in heart and in deed, as well as in name, even as Jesus was.

Let me aspire even to Thy heavenly perfections, O blessed Jesu, even to Thy most perfect glories. Pour forth Thy intercession continually at the throne of grace, that I may day by day increase in virtue, increase in favour with God and man ; that I may keep under my body, and press forward to the prize of my heavenly calling.

When I suffer affliction, let me think of Thy sorrows, which bowed Thee to the dust at Gethsemane ; when I suffer the revilings of men, let me think of the buffetings, the spittings, the scourging, which Thou without a murmur didst endure ; when I suffer injuries, O grant me the power and the spirit to say, “ Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.”

Finally, O Lord my God, most righteous, most holy, as the day now approaches when I shall yet once more encompass Thine altar, so the more earnestly do I implore Thee for that wedding garment which Thou prearest for Thy guests, so the more urgently do I seek, so the more quickly do I knock.

Cast out the evil spirits with which my heart is full ; drive them far away, and into their place suffer to enter the spirit of humility, the spirit of purity, the spirit of charity. Make me even as Thyself, all holiness and benignity ; all meekness and gentleness ; all love and righteousness ; and, when by Thy grace I am thus perfected and purified—when my days of human life are over, and my body shall receive its last resting-place, the inheritance of creeping things—O then, let my soul, redeemed of the Lord, wing its unimpeded flight to those regions of the blessed, to that everlasting rest, which remaineth by Thy promise for the people of God. Amen, through Jesus Christ.

SATURDAY.

HEAVENLY-MINDEDNESS.

“OUR conversation is in heaven.” *

If I am a Christian, I ought to desire “that mind which was in Christ Jesus.” I ought to follow not only His steps who *did* no sin, “neither was guile found in His *mouth*,”† but who *thought* no guile; I ought to study the temper and disposition of His affections, the tenor of His mind, the habits of His joys, and fears, and hopes.

“Where the treasure is, there will the heart be also.”‡ And if my real joy and hope were in heaven, there would be my business, there would be my life, there would be the tendency of all my thoughts, and cares, and wishes—for see the mind of Jesus.

When only twelve years old, He was found in the temple, disputing with the doctors; and when asked the reason, His reply was, “Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business?”§ At

* Phil. iii. 20.

† 1 Peter ii. 22.

‡ Luke xx. 34.

§ Luke ii. 49.

another time, with a whip of cords, He expelled the unholy merchants from the temple, zealous for His Father's glory; thereby fulfilling the prophecy of David: "The zeal of Thine house hath eaten me up."* The synagogue ever found Him ready: "As His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the sabbath-day, and stood up for to read."† The passover,‡ the feast of dedication,§ all the festivals of His Church and of His country, invariably found Him in the holy city, prepared to take His part. The worship of His heavenly Father, both in public and private; the prayer by night and day; in temptation, His resort to God; in the garden, His submissive cry, "Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine be done;"|| on the cross, His dying complaint, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"¶ and at the last, His final exclamation, "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit."**—In all these points, I behold the heavenly-mindedness of my Saviour.—His reference of all and every thing in life to *God*: "In all His ways He acknowledged God, and God directed His paths."††

And just so was the *teaching* of Christ.

* John ii. 15, and Ps. lxix. 9.

† Luke iv. 16.

‡ John ii. 13.

§ John x. 22.

|| Mark xiv. 36.

¶ Matt. xxvii. 46.

** Luke xxiii. 46.

†† Prov. iii. 6.

With the worldly-minded pharisees He argues, "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"* To his disciples He says: "I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn ye whom ye shall fear. Fear him who, after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell."† Of alms, he says: "Take heed that ye do not your alms before *men*, to be seen of them, otherwise ye have no reward of *your Father*, which is in heaven."‡ Of prayer, He says: "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father *which is in secret*, and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly."§ Of the whole character, He says: "Do not look to *men*; do not estimate your righteousness by theirs;" but "be ye perfect, even as your *Father which is in heaven* is perfect."||

Thus did He ever speak, contrasting the world with heaven, and man with God; counselling us of the vanity of the one, the joyful eternity of the other: "The friendship of the world is enmity with God;"¶ "Ye cannot be the servants of

* Matt. xvi. 26.

† Luke xii. 5.

‡ Matt. vi. 1.

§ Matt. vi. 6.

|| Matt. v. 48.

¶ James iv. 4.

two masters, ye must hate the one if ye love the other.”*

Then, let me consider :

Of which am *I* the friend ? Whose servant am *I* ? “They that are of the world speak of the world,”† yea, and think of the world. “*God* is not in all their thoughts.”‡ “That which is born of *God* overcometh the world.”§ If, therefore, I do not overcome the world, the probability is, that my spiritual birth is quenched. “The victory that overcometh the world is faith.”|| If, therefore, I have not succeeded in overcoming the world, the probability is, that I have not sufficient faith ; and if I have not sufficient faith, where is my salvation ?

Let me not, therefore, love that which is the enemy of *God*.

I must not, indeed, “be slothful in business ;” but then I must be “fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.”¶ “I must rise up early, and late take rest, and eat the bread of carefulness :”** but let it be not for worldly gain, but heavenly gain—let it be “about my *Father’s* business.” O let me not think “that my house shall continue for ever,

* Luke xvi. 13.

† 1 John iv. 5.

‡ Psalm x. 4.

§ 1 John v. 4.

|| Romans xii. 11.

¶ Ephes. cxxvii. 2.

** Psalm cxxvii. 2.

and that my dwelling-place shall endure from one generation to another, and call the lands after my own name.”* Let me not imagine that I can serve God and mammon together, and that the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils can stand upon the same table.† “The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.”‡ But let me part with that wisdom. Away with that wisdom which would give me a few fleeting hours of transitory glory, and then consign me to everlasting condemnation; away with that wisdom, “the wisdom of this world, which is foolishness with God.”§ Yea, let me rather be a “child of light,”|| and be accounted foolish by men, that I may be wise unto salvation before God.

Again. Shall I be a lover of pleasure? The world presents to me many a delight—many a gratification for my senses, for my intellect, for my social qualities; things not sinful in themselves, but therefore the more likely to win my heart from God: music, and painting, and the arts, and the sciences, the festive meeting, and the intercourse of beloved friends. But shall my soul be buried in these things? Shall I think no thought of God and heaven?

* Psalm xlix. 11.

† 1 Cor. x. 21.

‡ Luke xvi. 8.

§ 1 Cor. iii. 19.

|| 1 Thess. v. 5.

I would not, indeed, be an ascetic, morose and austere, looking on all the cheerful things of life with bitterness of face, and checking the glad hilarity of the social virtues of my fellow-creatures—but I would not be “a lover of pleasure *more* than a lover of God.”* I would not be from morning to night, and from night to morning, in one continued stream of selfish dissipation, having pleasure in men, and none in God; pleasure in myself, and none in my Redeemer. Let me remember, that the “pleasures of sin are but *for a season* ;”† but that at “God’s right hand, and there alone, are pleasures *for evermore*.”‡

Jesus never laughed. He wept but twice. Here, then, I can somewhat trace His heavenly-mindedness. There was no *extreme* in His character. No violent bursts of religious fervour on the one side, no coldness or depression of spirits on the other side; but he was always earnest, steady, and consistent. The pleasures of the world moved Him not. The sorrows which He endured moved Him not. For Lazarus He wept, but never for Himself. Heaven was before Him; He minded nothing else; God was present, and He cared to please no one else. In Him, and in Him alone, “He lived, and moved, and had His being.”§

* 2 Tim. iii. 4.

† Heb. xi. 25.

‡ Psalm xvi. 11.

§ Acts xvii. 28.

But shall I give up my friends, my beloved companions, and become a lonely being, hating my fellows? Surely not, for Jesus did not. He was ever *in* the world, though not *of* the world. I see Him sitting at meat with “publicans and sinners;”^{*} I see Him at the marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee;[†] but then He was showing forth God’s glory, and doing His Father’s business, even there. In the city, and in the field, He was among men and with men; but then it was for the glory of God. He never forgot the point at which He was aiming. Every step He took tended to the goal. Every thought He imagined looked towards the Father.

Then, O my soul, let thy conversation also be in heaven. Beware lest thou become like “the seed which fell among thorns, and was choked with the cares, and riches, and pleasures of this life, and brought no fruit to perfection.”[‡] Remember the great legacy which Jesus thy Saviour left to His disciples, in express distinction from the world: “Peace I leave with you, peace I give unto you, *not as the world giveth* give I unto you.”[§]

Heavenly-mindedness must be like Christ’s seamless coat, without rent from top to bottom. It must be all-pervading, and all-influencing. It

* Mark ii. 16.

† John ii. 1.

‡ Luke viii. 14.

§ John xiv. 27.

must be “the leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal.”* No particle of that meal can escape its pervading spirit. Not only at my going out, but at my coming in; not only in season, but out of season, I must look to my Saviour Jesus Christ. I must have no hope but through Him, no expectation or prayer but through Him; no knowledge of anything but Christ crucified, no capacity of pardon, or of grace, or of salvation, but by the merits of His death; “and whether I eat, or whether I drink, or whatever I do, I must do all to the glory of God.”†

Then, O my soul, be not content with a mere formal abandonment of *sin*. Be not content with a cold and stiff compliance with God’s will, but go further—let thy conversation be totally in heaven.

“Put on the Lord Jesus Christ.”‡

Desire to be “clothed upon with your house which is from heaven, if so be that being clothed, you shall not be found naked; not that you would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality may be swallowed up in life.”§

* Matt. xiii. 33.

† 1 Cor. x. 31.

‡ Gal. iii. 27.

§ 2 Cor. v. 2-4.

THE MEANS.

But how shall I attain this perfection of Christian character, “for who hath known the mind of the Lord?”*

First, let me honestly examine what the world is, and what heaven is. I will weigh them in the balance, and where the highest value is, there shall be my preference.

But what constitutes the value of a possession?

I. ITS DURABILITY.

Suppose I possess all the treasures of the world, its honours, its riches, its reputation. Yet will they endure? An *end*, sooner or later, they must have. But heaven is eternal. The things of the world, “like a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thy years fail not.”† The inheritance of the righteous shall be for ever, and they shall receive a crown of glory which fadeth not away.”‡

II. ITS STRENGTH.

There may be beauty in the countenance, and a goodly colour in the skin, and yet withal rottenness in the bones. The pleasures of the world present

* 1 Cor. ii. 16.

† Psalm cii. 26.

‡ 1 Peter v. 4.

a good appearance—the outward works are fair, but on what foundation do they rest? The foundation is of sand;—but the foundation of heavenly things is on the rock, and that spiritual rock is Christ.*

Riches may make to themselves wings.

Friends may be faithless.

The applause of the multitude varies with the wind, and, like the apostle Paul, we may be said at one moment to be a god, at another “a murderer.”†

But heaven—If I make Christ my peace, I am strong; if I make God my treasure, “no moth or rust can corrupt it, no thief break through and steal.”‡ If my hope is in Thee, O Lord my righteousness, no change of time shall weaken it. If God be my friend, He will be faithful and true; in time of need, He will be near at hand; in time of danger, He will help me.

III. THE CHEAPNESS OF THE PRICE.

Is the possession of the world a cheap possession? Have I paid nothing to obtain it? Is the service of mammon a light service? What toil, yea, what labour, yea, what sacrifice of all the noble and spiritual qualities of man, is there for the poor

* 1 Cor. x. 4.

† Acts xxviii. 4-6.

‡ Matt. vi. 20.

slave of this heavy taskmaster ! The tale of bricks will be demanded, and withal no straw to work them with.* He dares not disobey its commandments, be they ever so grievous ;—He dares not run counter to its customs, be they ever so absurd.

But the service of God ! “ Take my yoke upon you,” saith Jesus, “ and learn of me, my yoke is easy and my burden is light.”†

It exacts that only purity of body which contributes to health ; it requires that only purity of mind which contributes to serenity and peace ; it desires that only restraint which, if kept, I shall thank God for every day I live *here*, and which will produce *hereafter* such joy as no man taketh from me.

But I cannot from my own reason make my adjustments clear. My judgment is perplexed. The balance that I hold is unsteady. Well, then, there are other means at hand, and even better.

“ The sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.”‡ Here surely is a means sufficient ; here is a weapon by which, better than my own experience, I may cut my way through all the delusions of worldliness, and give my soul its flight to God.

Can I read that holy Book, and behold its warn-

* Exod. v. 18.

† Matt. xi. 29.

‡ Ephes. vi. 17.

ings, its assurances, its inward testimonies, and yet be of the world? Where can I find assertions for the eventual overthrow of the worldly given more strongly, than by the Spirit of God speaking in His holy scriptures? O let my meditation be therein by night and by day. Let me read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the sacred precepts of my God; and then, by patience and comfort of His holy word, I shall love the world less, and Jesus more; I shall rightly choose between God and Baal, and *promptly* choose; for surely, though the world “cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, until the blood gush out upon them, yet still the Lord He is the God—the Lord He is the God.”*

Nor less that holy sacrament, in preparation for which I am now in commune with my God. What means of reminding me of the joys of Heaven, and the vanities of the world could there be devised, so vivid, so effectual, so sure, as this? Here is presented to me the picture of my Saviour's death so faithfully, so truly! Here am I reminded of those grievous things which Christ endured, the stripes, the buffetings, the spitting—all which He did endure for *my sake*. O, shall I not hate the world which hated Him so bitterly? Shall I not with my soul's best affections follow Jesus, from the

* 1 Kings xviii. 21-39.

cradle to the cross, and from the cross to the grave, and from the grave to the resurrection, and from the resurrection to those blessed regions of glory where now He sits at the right hand of God, and have my conversation there?

O my soul, if thou art not moved by the body and blood of Jesus received in His holy Eucharist; if thou dost not become, by this, heavenly minded; if thou art not taught by this to go on thy way rejoicing in the Lord thy God in solemn undivided love; if thou dost not say to the pleasures, and cares, and riches of the world, away with them, away with the devices of the evil one; Thou only, O my Saviour, shall be my joy and my crown:—

Then Jesus has died to no purpose: “Thy faith is vain, thou art yet in thy sins.”*

But it will not be so.

“My grace is sufficient for thee.”†

“I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me.”‡

THE PRAYER.

Almighty and most merciful Father, King of heaven and earth—the source of every blessing—the fountain of all mercy—I adore Thee, I praise Thee, for Thy goodness; I lift up my voice to

* 1 Cor. xv. 17.

† 2 Cor. xii. 9.

‡ Phil. iv. 13.

Thee; O be not as though Thou hearest not, lest I be like to them that go down into the pit.

I confess to Thee, most righteous Father, that my affections have been too much in the world. My fears have been too much for men, my hope too much in the ambitions and glories of temporal things; but from this time grant me Thy grace, so effectually to work in my heart strength and renovation of character, that the world may be crucified unto me, and I unto the world; that Thy kingdom may henceforth be the sole delight of my heart, the sole object of my life.

Like as the hart desireth the water-brooks, so let my soul long after Thee, O God. So let it cast aside all other desires, so let it be hungry after the bread of life, and thirsty after the living water.

Thou givest me health and strength, activity of mind, and vigour of body. Thou givest me understanding, and knowledge, and Thy holy scriptures. Let me use these gifts as not abusing them. Let the strength of my manhood, and the vigour of my understanding, be Thine, exclusively and alone: let them be exercised in Thy service, devoted to Thy glory.

If riches increase—Prevent me that I set not my heart upon them.

If cares increase—Prevent me that I become not

as the seed, choked with them, and bring no fruit to perfection.

If the world praise me, and men admire me—Prevent me that I may remember Thy saying: Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for My sake.

If my affections and my zeal are dead—If they furnish a cold or partial service, the eye-service of those who please men, rather than that singleness of heart which fears God—O purge me and chastise me. Even though Thou comest with a rod and with anger, yet bring Thou me back to Thy service, and make me Thine again.

O blessed Redeemer, my hope, and my joy—Even as Thou, from Thy early youth even unto death, didst shew forth one single purpose—the glory of Thy Father. So give me Thy strength. So send me the Comforter whom Thou dost promise, that I also may have but one aim, that I also may be doing all things for Thy honour; so that, while I honour the Son, I may honour the Father also.

I cannot serve two masters. Thy dominion is undivided; Thy service distinct. Then let me cast away all notions of compromise, all notions of sufficiency; but bring before Thee, my God and my Saviour, my whole soul and body, my

substance, my words, my thoughts, my life; and, casting them before Thy throne, acknowledge Thee the Lord of all.

And now Thy day approaches. Thy holy Supper, O Lamb of God, if Thou sparest my life, and continuest Thy blessings to Thy Church, will, to-morrow, be made ready. O gracious sound of a most loving invitation, "*Draw near!*" O never-ceasing joy of the glad tidings of Christ; "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him!" O suffer me not to hear these words in vain. Let all things that appertain to man be banished and shut out. Take me, O Jesu Christ, as the shepherd of the sheep, and preserve me with Thy care. Be with me, sanctify me, comfort me, and let me be one of those blessed for whom Thou once didst supplicate Thyself:

"I pray for them. I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them through Thy truth."

Hear this, then, my prayer, O blessed Lord, and intercede with this Thine own voice where Thou sittest at the right hand of God the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, one God for evermore. Amen.

THE MORNING OF THE

EUCCHARIST.



THE PRAYER.

AND now, O Lord most gracious, most merciful, Thy holy feast has come. The table is now ready, the guests will soon approach. Thy holy altar is decked, the Priest is now preparing; I, also, though unworthy to eat even of the crumbs which fall from Thy table, yet I also will be there with my petition; O Lord, hear my cry, give ear unto my prayer.

I have recounted faithfully, I have confessed openly before Thy throne of grace the manifold sins with which my life is charged. The remembrance of them is grievous to me; the burden of them is intolerable. The infirmities of nature, the severity of the law, the sins of habit, the sins of temptation—all, all, have I poured forth to Thee; for all do I cry for help and for pardon. O Lord, deny me not, hold not Thy peace at my tears.

I will approach and be strong in Thy grace ;
I will look upon the sacred symbols of thy love ;
I will say to Thee, O Lord, help Thou mine unbelief ; increase my hope ; let joy and gladness once more visit my soul ; let me remember that though my unworthiness be great, Thy blood is sufficient to account me righteous, that Thy propitiation was made for the sins of the whole world.

I am taught by Thy holy word, that I am not mine own, that I am bought with a price, and that therefore I must glorify God in my body, and my spirit, which are God's. I thankfully acknowledge this ; it is my joy. What indeed could I do, if I were *not* Thine ? Where should I be if Thy precious blood had not redeemed me ?

But then Thou hast also promised that Thou wouldest not leave Thy disciples comfortless. Thou hast promised that Thou wouldest be with them until the end of the world. Fulfil Thy gracious promise, O Lord my Saviour, this day, yea, even this day be with me in the courts of Thine house, while I give thanks to Thee, most Highest. O suffer me not to be there in vain ; let all things belonging to the world be banished from my thoughts ; grant that I may dwell in Thee, and Thou in me, that I may be one with Thee, and Thou with me ; that my

mind may be as Thy mind, my spirit as Thy spirit.

Suffer me not to doubt. Suffer me not to fear. Suffer me not to pollute that spiritual communion, which this day I hope to have, with anything earthly. Let cares be cast aside, let pleasure be forgotten. Give me that heavenly-mindedness, that all-absorbing, all-influencing love, which shall be worthy of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ.

O God, Father of all mercies,

O Saviour, Redeemer of all sins,

O Holy Spirit, Sanctifier of all hearts,

Grant that I may this day so foretaste the spiritual joys of heaven, even while on earth—that here, seeing only in part, and knowing only in part, I may wait in patience for that glorious day, when I shall see Thee face to face, and know Thee even as I am known. Amen, Amen.

AFTER THE RECEPTION OF THE
EUCHARIST.

THE PRAYER.

It is finished. All my anxious thoughts and holy aspirations after the love of my Redeemer have been fulfilled. I have eaten of the broken Body. I have drunk of the Blood which Jesus shed. I have tasted and seen how gracious the Lord is.

And now, O my God, as I praise Thee for the past, and glorify Thy name, so let me pray for the future, that being consecrated anew, and devoted to Thy service, no fear or temptation, no want of faith, or relaxation of hope, may cause me to forget this holy covenant: that as Christ my passover has been as it were sacrificed anew this day in my heart, so I may keep the feast, not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

I am pledged, again pledged to Thy law, to Thy

gospel, to the spiritual perfection of my Redeemer's teaching. Though I may fall, yet let me sincerely endeavour. Help Thou my weakness, O God. Prevent me with Thy grace.

New life, new graces, new joys, new hopes, are mine this day. I have put on the Lord Jesus Christ again. I have been one with Him again. I have presented my body a living sacrifice unto Him again. O let it be holy and acceptable in His sight,—my reasonable service.

With God, my Father and Creator, my soul is at peace.

With Jesus, my Saviour and Redeemer, my soul is at peace.

With the Holy Ghost, my Sanctifier and Comforter, my soul is at peace.

Yea, and with all my brethren, creatures of the same God, and children of the same Father, my soul is at peace.

Grant that no evil accident may disturb this tranquillity, no want of charity violate this holy rest, no temptation cause me to fall.

But above all. As I have this day been present with the Lord in His crucifixion, so let me be with Him in His joyful resurrection. As I have been baptized with Him in the likeness of His death, so let me also be in the likeness of His resurrection. As I am now by Thy gracious sacrifice dead unto

sin, so let me be Thine, alive unto God, through Thee my Saviour.

Thou hast appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of Thyself. Thou wilt appear again to judge the world in righteousness: and when the dead shall at Thy second coming go forth to meet Thee in Thy kingdom, and when the holy angels shall prepare Thy seat for judgment, and the countless nations shall be judged for every deed done in the flesh;—O then, my Saviour, have mercy, have compassion. O Thou worthy Judge eternal, look upon me as having done Thy will, at any rate this day; as remembering Thy love, as trusting in Thy atonement, as faithful in Thy promises, as having put on the wedding garment and clothed myself in the righteousness of saints.

Thou didst promise, that where two or three are gathered together, there Thou wouldest be in the midst of them. We have been gathered together this day. Thou, indeed, hast been in the midst of us. Thou hast pleaded with us face to face.

Thou didst promise that, if Thou shouldest be lifted up, Thou wouldest draw all men unto Thee. We have beheld Thee this day lifted up; lifted up on Thy cross of sacrifice; lifted up in the resurrection; lifted up in Thy glorious ascension, to that heaven of heavens, whither thou hast gone before, our forerunner.

Even so, blessed Lord, let me be drawn unto Thee, according to Thy promise. Even so, blessed Lord, may I pass from death to life, from the grave to my joyful resurrection. Even so, may I sit down at Thy right hand, the ransomed of the Lord; waiting until that glorious time, when, with angels, and archangels, and all the host of heaven—with saints and martyrs, and spirits of just men made perfect—I shall dwell with Thee for evermore. Yea, I will come to Sion with songs, and I will have everlasting joy upon my head, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away, and I shall be with the Lord for ever.

Even so, come, Lord Jesus. Even so, hear, O my Father. Even so, through the blood of Thy dear Son, I pray,—Three in One, and One in Three.

“BLESSING, AND GLORY, AND WISDOM, AND THANKSGIVING, AND HONOUR, AND POWER, AND MIGHT, BE UNTO OUR GOD FOR EVER AND EVER.” AMEN.



DATE DUE

~~OCT 26 '84~~

~~DEC 10 1984~~

~~APR 19 1984~~

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01196 6951